The Transparent Conspiracy

Essays and Poems (mostly) on 9/11

Michael David Morrissey

Copyright © 2010 Michael David Morrissey

All rights reserved

ISBN-13: 978-1514725375

Contents

Preface 1

Essays

What the New Zogby Poll Tells Us about Propaganda, the Media, and Education 5
A Reply to Time 7
Stupidity Theory 12
Transparency Theory 18
The Onion Peeled 22
Back to Ground Zero 32
MITOP and the Double Bind 39
Martin Luther King and 9/11 46
The Linguistics of Deception 53
Chomsky and Newman – The False Debate 59
Deep State Doublethink 71
What Happens When Superpower Air Defenses Really Fail 75
McKinney Stronger in Unexpected Places 77
Dumbo in the Living Room 81
9/11 Aletheia 85
Was the Air Force Flyover a Warning to Obama? 95
The Truth Wars 100
Troo Wit Troot 103
Shill Heaven 106
Shock and Awe't 110
9/11, Anti-Semitism and Denial 112
Pulp Fiction 116
Brzezinski Censored (Again) 118
Prolegomena to a Theory of Ah 120

Controlled Demolition as a Limited Hangout 126
The "4,000 Jews Forewarned" Nonsense Again 130
Precautionary Principle aka Crimestop 133
No Planes 137
Hello Vietnamistan, Goodbye Obama 140
The Show Trial 142
Have URL, Will Travel 144
Transparent Underpants: MITOP Again 148
If I Met Poppy in a Pizza Parlor 153
Propaganda War or Infowar 157
Online Sex and Other Dreams 159
On the March 20 Demonstration in Washington 162
How to Quash a March: Chris Hedges Is Wrong 168
The Alchemy of Antisemitism 171
Noam Rocks On 173
Progressive Summit 175

Poems

Schoolyard	179
Homage à Lawrence Durrell	180
Jingo Bells	181
The President Malevolent	182
Jackie	183
Jason	184
Butcher Shop	185
Inside Job	189
Two Views of Reality	190
Noam	192
Jesus Was a Revolutionary	195
Hugo Chavez	192
Spanish translation of "Hugo Chavez"	197
On the Way to the Gas Chamber	199
Now That the Democrats Have Won	202
Classroom Visitor	203
War of the Worlds	204
Oh, Beautiful	207
Shake, Mohammed	209
The Cock-Up	212
Rosie O'Donnell	214
Sunrise at Buchenwald	215
Waiting for Obama	216

"Truth was the last thing on my mind, and even if there was such a thing, I didn't want it in my house. Oedipus went looking for the truth and when he found it, it ruined him. It was a cruel horror of a joke. So much for the truth. I was gonna talk out of both sides of my mouth and what you heard depended on which side you were standing. If I ever did stumble on any truth, I was gonna sit on it and keep it down."

-- Bob Dylan, *Chronicles: Volume 1*

"Denial ain't just a river in Egypt."

--Attributed to Mark Twain.

Preface

When I started posting these essays and poems on the internet in late 2006 I had the rather optimistic idea that eventually they might help me come to grips with the events of 9/11. This goal has been achieved to some extent, since I feel I have reached a point of understanding of what happened on that day beyond which I am not likely to progress significantly.

I wrote the first few essays under the general title "The Logical Reconstruction of Reality" because I felt, and still feel, that the events of 9/11 changed our perception of reality profoundly, and that this is true for all of us, except perhaps the perpetrators themselves and their collaborators (if that distinction is worth making).

I am not talking about the details of what happened – and more importantly, what did not happen (see the *9/11 Commission Report* for this). I have relied from the beginning on the work of David Ray Griffin for these details, and I agree with his conclusions. There is no reason to reinvent the wheel.

What I have tried to do, especially since Griffin and many others have provided overwhelming evidence that 9/11 was, indeed, an "inside job," is take this conclusion as the cornerstone for reconstructing the view of the world that we now have to live with and in. The key essay in this respect is probably "MITOP and the Double Bind."

"Made It Transparent On Purpose" is indeed speculation, pure "conspiracy theory," since I have no evidence for it whatsoever. On the other hand, I doubt whether any such evidence will be forthcoming in the foreseeable future, and that, too, is an important part of the reality we now face. At some point, when all the evidence is in that is likely to be coming in – and I fear we have just about reached that point – one has to "speculate" about how the world works, especially that considerable part of it that is controlled by other human beings. (9/11 was not, after all, an act of God or nature.) The alternative would be to exist with no more understanding of our situation than a beast in the field.

I prefer to call this common sense her than speculation. I have consistently rejected the attempts, which are rampant, to locate the source of evil in some real or imagined construct (Illuminati, Bilderbergers, "Zionists," etc.), because I feel that speculation of this sort is worse than useless (see "Deep State Doublethink" and the essays on anti-Semitism). In the end, though I still have my disagreements with Noam Chomsky, I have found that a rapprochement between "conspiracy theory" and the "institutional" analyses) of people like Chomsky is not only possible but urgent. The most negative aspect of progressive political struggle today I find to be not the difficulty or even impossibility of ascertaining the truth about various events, but the lack of ability or will on the part of truth-seekers of various stripes to overcome their factionalism and unite for a common cause, of which there are a great many (see "Progressive Summit").

The poems date from 1987 and also deal mostly – though not exclusively – with political themes, such as the war in Vietnam and the JFK assassination, as well as 9/11. Conspiracy is thus obviously a common thread, as it was in my earlier book *Looking for the Enemy* (2008). What has changed since 9/11/2001, in my view, is the willingness, even the desire, of the conspirators – while remaining anonymous as individuals – to make the nature and consequences of their actions transparent to all who dare to see. The logic of this notion of "transparent conspiracy" may not be immediately apparent, conspiracies being by definition secret, but as I wrote in "Sunrise at Buchenwald":

> Reason is but a mode the mind abides in.
> The rest is dark, like blood.

Let us hope that in this poem, written in a dark moment, I have exaggerated. We can still fight back. I hope we do, and that the necessary coalescence of progressive forces takes place before the worst occurs – again.

Essays

2006-2010

What the New Zogby Poll Tells Us about Propaganda, the Media, and Education

Sept. 9, 2006

The second Zogby poll commissioned by 911truth.org,[1] this one nationwide, allows a number of revealing conclusions, despite its failure to ask the crucial question of complicity that showed in the first (August 2004[2]) poll that 49.3% of New York City dwellers, and 40.9% throughout the state, agreed that "some leaders in the U.S. government knew in advance that attacks were planned on or around September 11, 2001, and that they consciously failed to take action."

Nevertheless, the question about WTC 7 in the second poll and the inclusion of a question about media performance, as well as the addition of the category of "educational level" in the statistical breakdown, provide a useful illustration of the relationship between the mainstream press, education, and the propaganda function of both in America today on issues of political importance.

The propaganda function of "the news" is easily demonstrated. People were asked how they would rate "the U.S. media's performance regarding 9/11." 42.8% thought the coverage was good or excellent.

The question about WTC 7 was worded more felicitously than in the first poll (where people were just asked to give the number of the "third skyscraper"):

> World Trade Center Building 7 is the 47-story skyscraper that was not hit by any planes during the September 11th attacks, but still totally collapsed later the same day. This collapse was not investigated by the 9/11 Commission. Are you aware of this skyscraper's collapse, and if so do you believe that the Commission should have also investigated it? Or do you believe that the Commission was right to only investigate the collapse of the buildings which were directly hit by airplanes?

42.6% answered that they were "unaware of WTC 7 collapse."

There is a startlingly exact correspondence, then, between the number of people who were positively impressed by the media coverage of 9/11 and the number who were unaware of the collapse of WTC 7, namely 43%! This is also very close to the number who think there has been a cover-up of "critical evidence" by the government and the Commission: 42.3%.

These figures become even more interesting when broken down for educational level. Although people in the lowest category (no high school diploma) were least likely to know about WTC 7, in the three higher categories the *lack of knowledge* is directly proportional to educational level: Only 38.6% of people with only a high school diploma were unaware of the collapse of WTC 7, but 43.2% of those with some college, and 43% of people with college degrees or graduate degrees, were unaware of this important fact!

Exactly the reverse is true of the belief that the investigation is a cover-up. 55.5% of those without a high school education "believe that the U.S. government and its 9/11 Commission concealed or refused to investigate critical evidence that contradicts their official explanation of the September 11th attacks." 47.5% of people with only a high school diploma believe this, and only 35.5% with some college, and a mere 33.7% with a college degree or graduate degree, believe this.

In other words, the higher the level of education, the *less likely people are to know about WTC 7*, and the *more likely they are to believe the government is telling the truth about 9/11*.

It would be hard to find a more convincing illustration of the propaganda function of formal education. As Noam Chomsky has said:

> There are huge efforts that do go into making people, to borrow Adam Smith's phrase, "as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human being to be." A lot of the educational system is designed for that, if you think

---

[1] See http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20060522022041421 and http://www.911truth.org/images/911TruthZogbyPollResults-DistributionByCategory.pdf.

[2] See http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20040830120349841.

about it, it's designed for obedience and passivity. [Interview with David Barsamian, excerpted from *Class Warfare*, 1995, pp. 19-23, 27-31, and reprinted online.[3]]

One must add that Chomsky himself is the best example of his own proposition, since he stubbornly refuses to give any credence to "conspiracy theories," e.g., about the assassination of JFK or 9/11, despite the abundance of evidence, while implicitly accepting the government-sanctioned versions of these events, which in the case of 9/11 is of course also a conspiracy theory.

[3] See http://www.chomsky.info/books/warfare02.htm.

A Reply to *Time*

Sept. 7, 2006

Time magazine, the flagship corporate-government mouthpiece, has always been good primarily for one thing – to let us know what Big Brother is thinking, and by the same token, to tell us what we should be thinking. (If you have to ask who Big Brother is, see below.)

Before I reached the age of reason, at the age of 42 when I realized that the mainstream media had been lying for at least a quarter of a century, since the murder of JFK, *Time* and *Newsweek* were my teddy bears. Read them and before you know it, you're fast asleep in a world that is in control, no matter how bad it seems. The right people are doing the right things.

That was true, of course, only not in the way I thought. I was the one who was under control. Instead of shouting bloody murder from the rooftops, I was dutifully reading myself to sleep, taking my soma every week.

This latest attempt (*Time*, Sept. 3, 2006[4]) to pacify the herd, to anesthetize us with the idea that "conspiracy theories" are defense mechanisms to protect ourselves from the big, bad, complex world, falsely "empowering" us "to make sense of grand events" is striking, even for *Time*, in its illogic.

Far from "empowering," the notion that the government itself perpetrated 9/11 has the opposite effect on most people. Who wants to believe that our elected leaders are ruthless, mass-murdering demonic pigs? Fear of having to believe this, and subsequent denial of whatever evidence and arguments would lead to this belief, are by far the most common reactions. Lev Grossman, Big Brother's hack in this instance, knows this as well as anyone else with common sense, and the ploy here is to skirt the fear by making the denial easier. It's not the idea that our leaders are monsters that we have to deal with, he is telling us, but the idea that some people (actually, as he says, 36% of the population) need an idea like this to feel as if they are "participating in the great American tradition of self-reliance and nonconformist, antiauthoritarian dissent." A mature thinker, presumably like Grossman himself, knows that "conspiracy theories are part of the process by which Americans deal with traumatic public events like Sept. 11," a curiously "American form of national mourning," and that – here is Grossman's overriding wisdom – "the past, even the immediate past, is ultimately unknowable."

So we know what Big Brother is about in this article, as always: Do not consider "outrageous conspiracy theories," as George II told us himself, shortly after promulgating the most outrageous conspiracy theory of all, namely that a (rich) cave dwelling Arab in Afghanistan and 19 henchmen with box cutters could defeat the multi-billion dollar U.S. Air Force and national defense establishment, not just once, but four times on a single day. Do not question this, we are meant to understand, and do not look for facts, because the past is "unknowable."

Granted, some people will fall for this. Maybe the other 64% of the population. Still, it is very bad propaganda. Big Brother may be losing his touch. Subtlety has never been his strong point, and since selection 2000 it has all but disappeared. I suppose we should be glad of that. The Bush government, a "Nixon imperial presidency on steroids," as John Dean (who should know) called it recently on C-Span, has made it quite clear what we are dealing with: fascism. We are one step, one more terror attack, away from the jackboots, as Gen. Tommy Franks[5] has told us in so many words, and the Patriot Acts have already gutted the Constitution and created the legal structure for a police state. (Don't believe me; read the recent speeches of former Vice-President Al Gore.)

If Big Brother were more concerned with subtlety, there are several different ploys he could have taken, but in this article he shows his hand quite clearly. Most conspicuously, we are given only two alternatives, two views of reality: world No. 1 and world No. 2. No. 1 is the official line. No. 2 is actually described quite correctly and straightforwardly:

> In world No. 2, al-Qaeda is not responsible for the destruction of the World Trade Center. The U.S. government is. The Pentagon was not hit by a commercial jet; it was hit by a cruise missile. United Flight 93 did not crash after its occupants rushed the cockpit; it was deliberately taken down by a U.S. Air Force fighter. The entire catastrophe was planned and executed by federal officials in order to provide the U.S. with a pretext

---

[4] See http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1531304,00.html.

[5] See http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2003/11/20/185048.shtml.

> for going to war in the Middle East and, by extension, as a means of consolidating and extending the power of the Bush Administration.

This is in fact an accurate statement of what most of those 108 million Americans (and 95% of the rest of the world) actually think. It does not say, as all too many 9/11 "truthers" say, that a "rogue faction" of the government did it, or that "factions of the government may have been involved" or "complicit." It does not differentiate between LIHOP ("Let It Happen on Purpose") and MIHOP ("Make It Happen on Purpose"), or say, as Kyle Hence, one of the most prominent "9/11 Truth" leaders did recently:

> Any simplistic speculations or accusations such as "the government did it" are irresponsible and premature in my view as all the evidence 'isn't in' and the reality is likely far more complex. What we know beyond a shadow of a doubt is that agencies across the board within the government covered-up, many officials lied, and some destroyed key evidence. We know that excessive secrecy, over-classification and delays in releasing CIA and FBI Inspector General and NIST reports have kept much vital information from the general public and official investigations about what happened or didn't happen and how it was covered-up. It is entirely conceivable that systemic or bureaucratic faults, incompetence, negligence (including criminal negligence) complicity and co-conspiracy ALL occurred within the gargantuan, byzantine government and global military-industrial-intelligence complex relative to the 9/11 attacks. Even a cursory examination of Operation Gladio, the 7/7 attacks in London, etc. suggests a far wider circle of co-conspirators. Any new investigation must consider all the evidence within the frame of the questions 1) who most benefited and 2) was 9/11 as Chris Floyd has suggested a 'secret army' Gladio-type operation designed to advance an extreme right wing agenda? SFC Donald Buswell, now under investigation in Texas, framed suspicion this way – rejecting the official conspiracy theory and Commission findings and pointing in the direction of the military-industrial complex. In the end we may find the reality more complex still given the huge power of drug, banking, illicit weapons and other criminal cartels and the fact that U.S. officials may have acted the part of guilty parties in some cases to cover-up their own incompetence or criminal negligence even as they were aware the official story didn't hold any water. [Email to me and others, Aug. 28, 2006]

Now here is subtlety. Could any of Big Brother's hacks have put it more eloquently? My question to Hence, to which the above was his reply, was:

> Do you agree with David Griffin that "the Bush-Cheney administration orchestrated 9/11 in order to promote this [American] empire under the pretext of the so-called war on terror" (p. viii, *Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11*)?

Griffin was not subtle at all, having come to this conclusion after examining all the available evidence and presenting it in three books. Hence and many other 9/11 "truth-seekers" claim to support and agree with Griffin, but when it comes down to it, they hedge. They squirm and wriggle and hem and haw and inundate us with "complexities" and all the "research" that needs to be done before we can say what Big Brother himself has said quite openly – at least if world No. 2 is real: the government did it.

Similarly, Grossman gives a quite acceptable summary of the facts about the Pentagon strike:

> …the crash site doesn't look right. There's not enough damage. The hole smashed in the Pentagon's outer wall was 75 ft. wide, but a Boeing 757 has a 124-ft. wingspan. Why wasn't the hole wider? Why does it look so neat?
>
> Experts will tell you that the hole was punched by the plane's fuselage, not its wings, which sheared off on impact. But then what happened to the wings? And the tail and the engines? Images of the crash site show hardly any of the wreckage you would expect from a building that's been rammed by a commercial jet. The lawn, where the plane supposedly dragged a wing on approach, is practically pristine. The plane supposedly clipped five lampposts on its way in, but the lampposts in question show surprisingly little damage. And could Hani Hanjour, the man supposedly at the controls, have executed the maneuvers that the plane performed? He failed a flight test just weeks before the attack. And Pentagon employees reported smelling cordite after the hit, the kind of high explosive a cruise missile carries.

And the counterarguments are sparse indeed:

> …if the Pentagon was hit by a cruise missile, then what happened to American Airlines Flight 77? Where did all the real, documented people on it go? Assassinated? Relocated? What about eyewitnesses who saw a plane, not a missile? And what are the chances that an operation of such size – it would surely have involved hundreds of military and civilian personnel – could be carried out without a single leak? Without leaving behind a single piece of evidence hard enough to stand up to scrutiny in a court? People, the feds just aren't that slick. Nobody is.

That's it. That's all Big Brother has to counter the accusations summarized in David Ray Griffin's three books and literally hundreds of websites and other books. Anyone who does the least bit of reading will soon learn that the eyewitnesses contradict each other drastically, and that what happened to the passengers (not "documented" by an impartial authority but only by the government; autopsy results have not been released) is indeed an ongoing mystery but secondary to the examination of the physical evidence.

Then we have the old canard and patently absurd argument – which doesn't stop people like Noam Chomsky, to the distress of many of his left-oriented admirers,[6] from repeating it – that such a high-level conspiracy could not have happened without a leak. Then how did Osama and his 19 helpers do it? Their "leak" was the *9/11 Commission Report*, a "571-page lie,"[7] as Griffin calls it (and proves amply in his book *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*).

Time could have produced a far more effective propaganda piece not only by repeating the arguments of Kyle Hence, but also by mentioning all the other theories about what actually happened on 9/11, including first and foremost the "no planes" theorists, who argue that no planes hit the WTC, that it was all video fakery. This is very much a bone of contention among the researchers, and a beautiful opportunity to paint the whole "truth movement" as ridiculous. Instead, they have given us a straightforward summary of what most of us do believe, and virtually nothing to contradict it. It's as if George Bush were telling us again, "You're either with us or against us." That does seem to be the real message. It is a declaration of war, and in war there is no need for subtlety.

Now I'm finished, and I haven't told you who Big Brother is, as promised. Let's make it easy. If you're in world No. 1, he is a figment of George Orwell's imagination. If you're in world No. 2, he is either what Kyle Hence says he is, or what *Time* and David Griffin says he is. My money's on the latter.

---

6 See *Looking for the Enemy* (2008), Ch. 7.5.

7 See http://www.serendipity.li/wot/571-page-lie.htm.

Stupidity Theory

Sept. 21, 2006

The two most frequent responses to the idea that the Bush administration orchestrated 9/11 are that 1) they wouldn't do anything so horrible to their own people, and 2) they are too stupid to do so even if they wanted to. 1) has been dealt with adequately elsewhere, most prominently by David Ray Griffin in all three of his books on 9/11, so suffice it to say here that precisely such horrible things have indeed been done before, often enough and with enough historical certainty that to claim it would not happen again is simply wishful thinking.

2) deserves more scrutiny, particularly now that we have a certifiably stupid president (though no exception, after Reagan) who fits perfectly into this scenario. With an obviously stupid man in the lead role, everyone else is more easily seen as equally stupid.

For example, on Sept. 10 an anonymous reader posted this response to my "Reply to *Time*," which I had posted on on bellaciao.org:

> OK, let's see now, the Administration that couldn't coordinate hurricane relief, royally screwed up a prescription drug plan, didn't come close to providing a new social security scheme, never planned well for the "war on terror," couldn't negotiate successfully with Turkey for a northern corridor into Iraq, bought Chalabi's load of crap, already lost in Iraq, couldn't provide tactical support or the appropriate weaponry for the Israeli attack on Lebanon, is lost when it comes to immigration policy, couldn't figure out how to run Homeland Security, has experienced countless defections from within, is run by a leader who just recently learned how to pronounce nuclear, was forced to plant false intel and "journalism," which the FCC is now cracking down on, has narrowly avoided another NASA catastrophe, abrogated civil rights yet accrues virtually no worthwhile intelligence, isolates traditional allies, marginalizes the U.N., helped bring down every foreign leader, including Blair, who supported it, has been unable to hide its own political corruption, nominated a Supreme Court candidate its own party blasted, put the U.S. in deeper debt than it has ever been in, is unable to talk with other nations such as N. Korea because of a basic lack of diplomatic skills, has isolated many military generals who've repeatedly demanded Rumsfeld's resignation, systematically ignores critical analysis coming out of the CIA and the military, introduces a color code for alerts that became a national joke, can't figure out how to provide sufficient protection to U.S. troops who are first forced to make their own and then are penalized for doing so, are unable to successfully prosecute Gitmo detainees for lack of evidence, was, somehow, amazingly, MIRACULOUSLY, able to coordinate a complex series of attacks that required months of tight-lipped planning, with utter perfection, and not one individual out of what must be hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals involved in such a plot spills the beans and offers real evidence.
>
> What are we left with? Fuzzy tapes of the Pentagon and the crash in PA that are far from conclusive. Is it possible, even likely that Flight 93 was shot down by the USAF? Perhaps. And, arguably, there were sufficient grounds for doing so. If the government's lying about that it's not because of some Big Brother conspiracy; quite the contrary. They're covering it up because they're too afraid of public condemnation and, of course, losing their jobs. If that happened, however, there's no A = B, no: they shot the plane down so "they" brought the buildings down. Granted the Pentagon situation is suspicious. But in retrospect, was that hit necessary as a Pearl Harbor type of event to prompt the "war on terror"? No. The New York hits were sufficient on their own to merit a warlike response. Why go to such extremes? It doesn't make sense since this Administration has consistently demonstrated a minimalistic approach to government in every task it does. And as far as the Twin Towers, no one can conclusively prove they were brought down by anything other than the planes that hit them.
>
> But let's say, Big Brother did all these things conspiratorialists are claiming. They were aided by the hijackers themselves who did get on those planes with the intent to terrorize. There's no doubt about that. The loss of life and the incipient fear that pervaded the country are genuine tragedies regardless of what or who caused them. But the absurd "war on terror," the prospects for an attack on Iran and the lack of respect for diplomacy and U.S. allies are producing far worse consequences than 9/11. The neocons were and are desperate to hold power. Could they have resorted to such tactics? Maybe. But if what they're now doing to the world is not stopped soon, the consequences are going to make 9/11 look like a picnic. Why don't we concentrate on that rather than being obsessed about uncovering a grand conspiracy that would, if real, represent the only project the Administration has so far completed successfully.

I replied (Sept. 12):

> This is the "stupidity" argument that is always raised against any sort of "conspiracy" theory. By the way, we have a Dept. of Conspiracy embedded in the U.S. government, parallel to similar institutions in all governments, called (used to be anyway) the "Dept. of Operations" (CIA). There more than two people plan bad (illegal) stuff on a regular basis. That is the legal definition of conspiracy. All governments are therefore in part at least institutionalized conspiracies.
>
> The fact that this institution (whatever part of it was involved directly) was able to do something spectacular does not mean they can or care about doing other things "right." Did they ever want to actually "win" the Vietnam war, for example? Of course not. Other factors are involved. Creating a spending hole for the warmongers, for example.
>
> The simplest answer to this whole argument, though, I mentioned in my piece, which is that if a caveman and 19 helpers could do it, "even" the Bush administration could do it. It is absurd to claim otherwise.

Whereupon this rejoinder (13 Sept.), perhaps from the same person, although I don't know:

> Is that Department of Operations you refer to the same one that tried for about 20 years to kill Castro with exploding cigars and tainted brandy? Or, for that matter, is it the same one that decided to back Castro because they couldn't figure out what his true allegiances were? Is it the same Dept. that in part was responsible for bringing a bible to Iran to appease the fundamentalists after their boy, the Shah, was deposed? Is it the same group that sent Oliver North to Nicaragua to fight a few hundred communists who had absolutely no chance of succeeding on their own? Is this, perhaps, the group that decided establishing dictatorships throughout Central and South America would be in the best interests of America? That's really worked out well, huh?
>
> Is this the same group, maybe, that has so successfully fought the "war on drugs"? Is this the group whose mighty intelligence gathering helped finally bust that international threat - the one they had backed for years - Noriega? Is this the group that seeded the Afghan resistance movement, out of which grew bin Laden's ragtag "terrorists"? Did this same said group rubber stamp the shipment of chemical weapons to Saddam Hussein to fight Iran - a far weaker force that could've been defeated with foot soldiers? Is this the same group that couldn't ascertain that Hussein was about to attack Kuwait much before Hussein told the State Dept.? And was subsequently unable to assert or negate the existence of WMDs in Iraq 2002?
>
> The litany, as you know, is far longer than space provides for here. How is it that the CIA is so far superior to every branch of this inept govt.? How is it you've come to believe they're not afflicted with the same "stupidity" that rules the entire fed. gov.? As much as you may think you know, you'd best be served by hitting the history books again and readjusting your conspiratorial radar to match reality.

My response (18 Sept.):

> Thanks for that thorough rehash of the stupidity theory. This is very similar to the current government-mass media promulgated theory that the military could not possibly have stood down on 9/11 because everybody involved, in the military and at the FAA, was just too damn stupid to do the things they are trained to do and do as a matter of routine at least 100 times a year (except on 9/11/01).
>
> You are probably right that most things Big Brother does are conspicuously stupid, but then, it has to be that way, doesn't it, or there would be no absolving stupidity theory.
>
> Note, however, that regardless of how stupid the execution of the crimes and the cover-up are, if he wants to get away with it, he does (9/11 is a good example).
>
> Which leads us to the obvious conclusion that this is not a question of rocket science. It is a question of who's got the bigger stick.

Another case in point is the recently released NORAD tapes. Both the *Vanity Fair* article[8] (and David Griffin's fine analysis[9] of same) are so detailed and complex as to make for agonizing reading, but let us skip to his conclusion:

---

[8] See http://www.vanityfair.com/pdf/pressroom/advance_Air_Force_9-11.pdf.

[9] See http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=2006091418303369 and http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20060914191232454.

> The new story is hence best seen as the military's replacement of its old story, which did not fully get it off the hook, with its new story, which does.
>
> Seen in this light, the now established fact that the military has lied about 9/11 has a perhaps unforeseen implication – that there is no good reason to take the military's new story on faith. **For if the military was lying to us between 2001 and 2004, we have no basis for trusting what it says now. To appreciate this point, it is important to get the logic of the situation right. The truth of the new story would imply the falsity of the old story. But the falsity of the old story would not imply the truth of the new story: they could both be false. And if the previous story, which only partly absolved the military from suspicion, was a lie, should we not suspect that the new story, which *fully* absolves it, is also a lie?** [My emphasis.]
>
> This implication will not be seen, to be sure, as long as one accepts the narrative promulgated by the 9/11 Commission and repeated by the *Times* – that the military had to be "forced" to tell this story, to its great embarrassment, by the 9/11 Commission. But once we see that this is the military's new story, which it used the 9/11 Commission to tell (albeit perhaps with some coaching from this Zelikow-led body), then we have reason not to accept this new tale without examining its inherent plausibility, its conflict with prior reports, and the possibility of fraudulently produced tapes.
>
> And when this tale is examined with those questions in mind, I have suggested, there are many reasons to consider it a lie.

As Griffin says, the received truth universally accepted by the mass media is, and most likely will remain, that the tapes are authentic, and (as the *Vanity Fair* article also suggests) the military lied in their previous stories. Griffin's argument (a convincing one) is that they are also lying now.

However, we can simplify. The bottom line here, again, exonerating the government is the Stupidity Theory. How did it happen? How did 19 Arabs with box cutters, directed by an Afghan caveman, penetrate the multi-billion-dollar U.S. national air defense system and strike deadly blows at the heart of the defense establishment in Washington and the financial center in New York?

The answer: Stupidity. Confusion. Incompetence. Whether it was NEADS or the FAA hardly matters. Just as various agencies "failed" to foresee and prevent the attacks ("connect the dots"), now we are supposed to believe that the national air defense system failed because of "confusion."

To add insult to injury, no one responsible for the failure of the government to do its most important job, which is to protect its citizens, was fired, or even criticized – much less impeached, which is what should have happened to Bush, Cheney and Rumsfeld. Contrast this with the Soviet reaction when a German teenager, Mathias Rust,[10] landed on a bridge close to Red Square in 1987. Gorbachev fired the defense minister, anti-air defense commander, and more than 2,000 other officers.

So regardless of who was lying when or whether they were lying or just stupid ("failed to connect the dots"), the Bush-Cheney government failed in the most spectacular way it possibly could (short of, say, nuclear holocaust, which may be next) on 9/11. We don't even need the argument that they did it on purpose. "Stupidity" does not work. It might have worked in many of the cases my interlocutor(s) above suggest, but 9/11 is completely inexcusable.

With this perspective, let us return to our point of departure, which is Big Brother's (I mean *Time's*) division of reality into two worlds: world no. 1 of *official* conspiracy theory (Bin Laden and his cohorts did it) and world no. 2 of *outrageous* (to use GWB's word) conspiracy theory (Bush et al. did it). *Time*, *Vanity Fair*, the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, NBC, CBS, ABC, Fox etc. all live in world no. 1, of course, and we are compelled to apply the stupidity theory to them too, since none of them, not a single one, has dared to raise the obvious argument that I have just made, which is that a government stupid enough to be successfully attacked as it was on 9/11 should be thrown out on its ass (as a first step).

It is interesting, and instructive, to use this crucial example of stupidity, the (supposed) failure of the national air defense system, to test the plausibility of the more schizophrenic views of reality that abound within world no. 2, whereby virtually everyone is suspected of being the source of evil – from Noam Chomsky, in cahoots with John Deutch and a teachers pension fund and French industrialists (David Hawkins[11]) to mysterious "elements" either within the U.S. government itself or connected with Illuminati, Freemasons, Bilderbergers,

---

[10] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Athena_Rust.

[11] See http://video.google.pl/videoplay?docid=-6384022783235737393&hl=pl.

Zionists, international bankers, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, the CIA, Mossad, Opus Dei – in short, as Kyle Hence succinctly put it (see "A Reply to *Time*"), some mysterious constellation of conspirators within the "gargantuan, byzantine government and global military-industrial-intelligence complex."

We need only ask ourselves how these hugely complex and mysterious forces managed to create the "confusion" at NEADS and the FAA to see how absurd and far-fetched they are. Such theories of purposely induced confusion are even more implausible than the idea that there was confusion in the first place, which is implausible enough, thus adding implausibility to implausibility.

Let us not fail to see the main point, which is that all of these schizophrenic Mysterious Evil Forces theories end up in exactly the same place as the Stupidity theories: the government is innocent. They are either Good Guys that make mistakes (Stupidity), or Good Guys controlled by mysterious Bad Guys (Mysterious Evil Forces). In either case, the remedy would be simple if this were a world of reason: throw the bums out. Who wants incompetents or puppets running the government?

But these two points of view both belong to world no. 1, which is not the world of reason. In world no. 2, which is rational, the Good Guys are the Bad Guys. Simple as that. It is still a world of kings and slaves, as it has always been. What makes it complicated now is that so many of us (though the number is decreasing) don't know it, and don't want to know it, preferring illusion (world no. 1) to reality (world no. 2).

Transparency Theory

Sept. 22, 2006

In "Stupidity Theory" I discussed two theories of the way things are in world no. 2 – the Stupidity theory and the Mysterious Evil Forces theory. That brings me to a third view, which is the diametrical opposite of Stupidity theory: they **want** us to know.

When I was researching the JFK assassination in the late 80s and early 90s, I ran across this idea for the first time in my own head, in a letter to Harold Weisberg (Oct. 29, 1990):

> In fact, in retrospect, the entire assassination and cover-up seem so crudely done that I wonder if the crudeness wasn't intentional. What better way to let us know, without admitting it outright, that they had (and have) us by the balls? Maybe they were saying: "Look what we can do. We blew his brains out in broad daylight, created a fairy tale, and got away with it. You can be as suspicious as you like, but we're in total control, and there's nothing you can do about it."
>
> After all, they could have just dropped a pill in his coffee. CIA and their friends certainly had the techniques for causing "natural" deaths in 1963 just as they do now. Why go to the trouble of a public ambush and massive cover-up when it could have been done without anyone even suspecting foul play?

I subsequently called this the "let's let 'em know we've got 'em by the balls" theory, but three years later, after I started corresponding with Vincent Salandria, I discovered that he had had the same thought many years before, in 1977, and published it in a brilliant essay called "The Design of the Warren Report, to Fall to Pieces,"[12] not failing, with his typical honesty, to attribute the origin of the idea to his friend Thomas Katen:

> To my friend, Professor Thomas Katen, I owe the brilliant insight which he has characterized as the "transparent conspiracy." Tom propounded the view that the Warren Report was not a cover-up, but rather was a transparent conspiracy, the purpose of which was to reveal the assassination to be a conspiracy although the Report seemed to have been endeavoring to prove a single assassin killing.
>
> Tom's concept was that the Warren Commission covered up the conspiracy in such a gross and clumsy way so as to reveal intentionally the existence of conspiracy. Make no mistake about it, the Warren Commission and its staff were made up of very able men. If these men had wanted to cover up the conspiracy more effectively they could have done so. As we shall see, the cover-up was accomplished in such a self-defeating fashion that one would have to suspend common sense and respect for evidence in order to accept the Report's conclusions.

Thus I defer to my friend Vincent's (and Katen's) formulation of "transparency" to describe this idea, and to Vincent's essay for a thorough and eloquent exposition of it. Reading it, you can substitute "9/11 Commission Report" for "Warren Report" and "the events of 9/11" for "assassination," and the analysis will be as trenchant and relevant today as it was in 1977.

I will excerpt only a couple of passages:

> So the transparent nature of the assassination in a very real sense framed us all; made us feel guilty, and served to paralyze us in a gripping sense of inadequacy. The transparent conspiracy paved the way for our despair and demoralization of the people. It eroded our trust in the nation states. But the alienation was deeper and more personal than the separation of people from confidence in their governments. The transparency of the assassination effectively destroyed politics. A counterculture was cultivated by the media and supported by the establishment which was to substitute for constitutional democracy and serve as an outlet for dissident energies.…
>
> Either Aldous Huxley anticipated all of this or the killers of Kennedy, having read Huxley well, employed his work as a model for our society…In *Brave New World Revisited* Huxley said:
>
> "The older dictators failed because they could never supply their subjects with enough bread, enough circuses, enough miracles and mysteries. Nor did they possess a really effective system of mind-manipulation. Under a scientific dictator education will really work – with the result that most men and women will grow up

[12] See *False Mystery: Essays on the Assassination of JFK*, 2004.

> to love their servitude and will never dream of revolution. There seems to be no good reason why a thoroughly scientific dictatorship should ever be overthrown."

Salandria's analysis is more sophisticated than mine, but omits the most obvious idea implied by my "let's show 'em" formulation, which is intimidation: those who get it, who understand the transparent message, will be scared and shocked into resignation. "All resistance is futile" is the message. In Gulf War II we learned another term for this strategy: "Shock and Awe."

I think it was Carroll Quigley who created the metaphor of the onion as a propaganda model, which fits here. Given Salandria's (and Huxley's) analysis, the transparency will not be obvious to everyone, and not at the same time. One can think of this in terms of a four-skin onion:

1. Those who believe what they are told by the authorities will be happy with the onion as it is.
2. Those who see through the first layer ("received truth") will be sufficiently confused to carry on researching the infinite mysteries of the issue (including those supplied as false leads by the perpetrators) forever, or at least until it doesn't matter anymore (which is not as long as one might think).
3. Those who see through to the third layer and recognize their own government as "complicit" will have to deal with the considerable psychological barriers of fear and denial, in addition to the wall of the mass media, and thus only a few will carry on to level 4.
4. Those who see through the first three layers to the heart of the onion ("we got'cha") will lose heart, recognizing not only the power they are up against but also the incapacity and/or unwillingness of their compatriots to share their insight.

In *Time's* analysis (see "A Reply to *Time*"), world no. 1 comprises level 1, and to some extent level 2. (Even the 9/11 commissioners admit that there are unanswered questions.) World no. 2 comprises level 3, and to a much smaller extent, level 4.

As I implied in my earlier essay, however, Big Brother, via *Time*, may well be trying to simplify things. Judging by the quality of the cover-up, one has to think this is the case. If the *Warren Report*, with its 26 volumes and one million words, was a pack of lies, the *9/11 Commission Report* can only be described as a travesty of a pack of lies (in David Ray Griffin's words, a "571-page lie"[13]). Perhaps Big Brother feels a two-skin onion will be easier to handle than a 4-skin one, hence the simpler choice (sidestepping the myriad more complex variations within the 9/11 "truth movement" itself) between world no. 1 and world no. 2, echoing George Bush's warning on Nov. 6, 2001 that "You're either with us or against us in the fight against terror."

Salandria concluded his article in 1977:

> Each of us must draw strength from the present. From the present we must seek to understand power and the tools of mind control. We must presently accept that tyranny has gained new and effective technology in its age-old war against man's liberty. In studying the present we must raise our threshold of fear so that we can face hard truth. Hard truth will tell us that everywhere power seeks to defeat man's individuality, to program man to be alienated from all other men; to manipulate man to seek pleasure and not responsibility. The present task of those who love humanity is to get men and women to move, work, and join together in common love of human freedom, knowledge and justice….
>
> As a first small effort toward these ends, let us engage now in a discussion wherein we will use the Kennedy assassination not as a mechanism for practicing a debilitating exercise in doublethink, but rather let us use the assassination as a means of expanding our understanding of our times.

This obviously did not happen. Although the majority of Americans, according to the polls, have believed the assassination was an inside job virtually from the day it happened, we did not heed the warning and face "hard truth" but instead allowed ourselves to be bamboozled into a ten-year war in Vietnam. Now, in 2006, we have had 9/11, two wars and a third one looming, and again a population slowly but surely seeing through the warmongers' ruse (36% and growing).

---

[13] http://www.serendipity.li/wot/571-page-lie.htm

David Griffin appeals to the churches and the *New York Times*.[14] Others are calling for a Generals' Coup (as recently in Thailand), indictments, or at the very least, impeachment. The onion seems to be splitting right down the middle. Another 9/11 will galvanize only half the country, if that. The other half may well be galvanized into revolt, and there will be civil war: world no. 1 against world no. 2 – not to forget that the rest of the planet will be on the side of world no. 2.

Is that what Big Brother wants? Martial law and half the population dead or in prison? That seems to be the case, and if it is, I hope that cooler heads prevail – that somewhere, at Langley or the DOD, or in the White House, somebody is telling our bullet-headed would-be World Controllers, "Look, it didn't work. Let's give 'em back the Democrats." That wouldn't be much, but it would buy us some time, which I'm afraid is the most we can hope for at the moment.

[14] See *Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11* (2006).

The Onion Peeled

Sept. 28, 2006

This is the hard part. Having peeled the onion (see "Transparency Theory"), what do we do with it? Since I didn't set out to change reality, but only to reconstruct it, maybe I shouldn't even try to answer this question, because whatever answer I give will be unsatisfactory – to me as well as everyone else. I will be denounced as a wimp and perhaps a cointelpro agent by those who want a revolution, in the form of a popular uprising or a General's Coup, with indictments and arrests. Morgan Reynolds,[15] a former Bush appointee in the Dept. of Labor and director of the Criminal Justice Center in Dallas, has a list of a couple of hundred names, from Bush and Cheney on down, that he is ready to send to the dock, if only there were a prosecutor willing to do it. Col. Donn de Grand-Pre,[16] U.S. Army (ret.), predicts a military "counter-coup" in the near future by generals and officers fed up with the takeover of the military by the civilian "globalist elite" (who staged the coup on 9/11). More than a few seem ready to fight. As one reader of "Transparency Theory" put it: "We know the truth, we're not going to back off, we're not going to abandon hope, AND WE'RE GONNA KICK THEIR ASSES!"

At this end of the spectrum, even the word "impeachment" provokes vituperative disdain:

> Calls for "impeachment" advance a left-gatekeeper meme that is designed to conflate any opposition with the official controlled opposition (principally the Democratic Party, moveon.org, etc.). Very clever way to muddy the waters and BURY the 9/11 murder/treason/fraud crimes by watering them down and trivializing them. After all, there are a million implied reasons for "impeachment": from Valerie Plame to WMD to Abu Ghraib to Tom Delay garden-variety corruption – all watered-down and undifferentiated, all red herrings and all completely subordinate to the generic brainwashing and social-control functions of the fake Democratic/Green/whatever "opposition." After all, the president before this one was IMPEACHED for a misplaced cigar and a stained blue dress. So the American public (and the world at large) has already been educated and conditioned to interpret the IMPEACHMENT meme as a twisted joke and trivialization of crimes. Anyone who is serious about nailing the 9/11 perps will not be calling for "impeachment." They will be calling for ARRESTS – indictments, arrests and criminal trials. Because the term "impeachment," especially in American popular understanding, equates to false, fake phony opposition and media preoccupation with sex in the Oval office.

At the other extreme, there are those who react just as Big Brother wants us to, either by not going inside the onion at all, no matter how "radical" their politics (Noam Chomsky), by not going beyond layer 2, where "complexity" makes any sort of action impossible except "more research" (Kyle Hence, see "A Reply to *Time*"), or by succumbing to the "shock and awe" of transparency. As another reader wrote:

> If we believe that man's continued evolution is both inevitable and irresistible, should we not simply accept the emerging changes in social engineering and political control in the hope that, by not slowing down the rate of change with seemingly futile protest, evolution will more rapidly progress towards a more enlightened age?

So let us take stock again of the reality *Time* and Big Brother have offered us, adding one more world (a much less populated one) for those who believe in the Transparency theory. (World no. 2, those who think Bush et al. did it, can accommodate both the Stupidity theorists and the Complexity theorists.) If we compare this with the situation in 1968, five years after the JFK assassination, there are similarities (a war on in both cases), but there is also a significant difference. How many candidates for Congress were running on a "reinvestigate the assassination" platform? I don't think there were any, and I doubt that there were any who even mentioned it.

Today, however, five years after 9/11, we are also in the middle of a war with a rising body count and no sign of an end, much less "victory," and that is indeed more of an issue than 9/11 in most people's minds, but there are at least seven congressional and one presidential candidates running with "9/11 truth" in their platform:

---

[15] See http://nomoregames.net/index.php?page=home.

[16] See http://www.prisonplanet.com/022904degrand.html.

Karl Schwarz (for president, 2008)
John Buchanan (for president, New Hampshire)
Mary Maxwell (New Hampshire, 2nd District)
Carol Brouillet (California, 14th District)
Robert Bowman (Florida, 15th District)
Mathew Woodson (Oklahoma, 5th District)
Craig Hill (for senator, Vermont)
Dennis Morrisseau (for representative,Vermont)

Since writing this I have discovered others. 911truth.org also lists:

Howie Hawkins, Grn, NY, Senate
David Nolan, Lib, AZ, House Dst 8
Samm Simpson, Dem, FL, House Dst 10
Bob Fitrakis, Ind, OH, Governor
Donna Mancini, Lib, KY, House Dst 3
Michael Metti, Lib, CA, Senate
Brian Moore, FL, Senate
Peter White, Indep, MA, House Dst 10
Morgan Stack, Irish parliament

One big reason for this difference is that the connection between the assassination and Vietnam was relatively non-existent in the public mind in 1968. Even today, despite the Oliver Stone film JFK, whose main thesis is that the assassination was an inside job by the warmongers whom Kennedy was threatening to deprive of their lucrative war in southeast Asia, respectable sources continue to disbelieve it (see my long correspondence[17] with Noam Chomsky on this point). By contrast, the connection between 9/11 and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and possibly Iran, is very clear, being the original "official" (though fraudulent) justification for them.

Thus there are at least two strong streams of pressure, the anti-war movement and the 9/11 truth movement, that can potentially merge into a dangerous threat to Big Brother. Unfortunately, though, the "9/11 truth movement" is cracked into a number of pieces, failing to present one face, which would make it stronger and more dangerous to the powers-that-be. It would only be logical for it also to be teeming with deep-cover agents of Big Brother intent on keeping the "movement" fragmented and chasing its own tail. What exactly was the substance used to explode the WTC? Was it a plane or a missile at the Pentagon? Were the videos of the WTC faked? Can a largely aluminum plane really sink into a steel-frame concrete building without any sign of damage or immediate explosion, disappearing into the wall of a building like a hot knife into butter? Were there any planes at all? Where is the plane debris?

As long as "researchers" can be kept busy with their research and internecine squabbles ("no-planers" vs. "plane-huggers"), they will not organize themselves into a political movement. Hence it is to Big Brother's advantage that the potential opposition remain fragmented in as many separate pieces as possible. Thus we have researchers calling each other "frauds," "liars," "plagiarists," "agents," "shills," etc., when with a little tolerance amongst themselves they could agree on a concerted action, like impeachment, as the basis for moving a lot of people in a way that Big Brother would have to notice.

The first devastating rift in the movement came over the Pentagon attack. Some claim the plane had to be a smaller one, but was still a plane; others say it was a cruise missile or a UAV (Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, such as the Global Hawk). Those who agreed on controlled demolition of the WTC concentrated on their differences, with the more conservative group taking it upon itself to "debunk" the more speculative groups, thus doing the government's job, but with the justification that they were actually fending off a government set-up, a trap, which would be sprung at some point in the future when the government releases the videos of the Pentagon hit, of which there seem to be more than 80, almost all of them still classified. "Aha," the

[17] See *Looking for the Enemy* (2008) and "Chomsky and Newman – The False Debate," in this volume.

government will say, "you see your theories about no-planes are wrong and ridiculous. We can see that now because we can see the plane in the Pentagon videos – just like we saw the planes in the WTC videos." This, fear the conservatives, would be a deadly blow to the truth movement in general.

Others argue that this conservative approach is really cointelpro strategy to prevent people from accepting the idea that no plane hit the Pentagon, because once they do that, the government is definitely exposed. If forced to, if there is enough public pressure, the government might admit that those clever A-rabs must indeed have planted explosives, and then try to explain how they could do that with the security of the buildings guaranteed by none other than a company whose board of directors included the president's little brother Marvin until shortly before 9/11.[18] That in any case would be easier to explain, or stall on, than the Pentagon story, because nobody is going to believe that bin Laden's 19 Arabs shot a missile or a UAV into the Pentagon, or that anybody could do that except the U.S. military itself. Thus one can argue that it is in the interest of Big Brother to limit the discussion to the question of controlled demolition at the WTC.

We may have seen some evidence of this limited hang-out beginning to happen, when Bush make the remark recently about "explosives"[19] at the WTC, although this may have been a mere slip of the tongue. Despite the internal bickering, the truth movement, merely by growing, has become united and more threatening, I think, on the issue of controlled demolition, which is easily expressed and which hardly anyone in *Time's* world no. 2 disagrees with. This could lead to real empowerment, if people had the will and ability to build a political movement on the basis of what they agree on instead of fighting like Kilkenny cats.

Why is it that we find the word *impeach* on so few 9/11 truth websites? How many of the 9/11 truth candidates listed above have a link to any of the rest of them? (None that I could find.) Why are they not working together? Candidates with a common stand on an issue like 9/11 cannot afford not to work together, can they?

This demonstrates, to quote Salandria again, how "the transparent nature of the assassination" [read "9/11"] has "served to paralyze us in a gripping sense of inadequacy" and "effectively destroyed politics" (see "Transparency Theory"). Even without the anthrax letters[20] to two Democratic senators and the news media shortly after 9/11, the notion that this attack was supported by forces considerably more powerful than the current Republican officeholders must have imposed itself on many of those close to the seats of power. It has been suggested that all of the major intelligence services around the world understood immediately that it was an inside job. For any of them to admit this, of course, is an entirely different proposition. The most effective dissenters so far have been Republicans, like Morgan Reynolds, Paul Craig Roberts, and Congressman Ron Paul of Texas. Why haven't the Democrats, or the Greens or the Libertarians, for that matter, jumped on 9/11 like dogs on a bone, especially after the totally fraudulent nature of the Commission Report has been so clearly exposed?

David Griffin, who is probably the person most responsible for this exposure, speculated at the end of his recent talk in Copenhagen[21] that the "elites," of whatever party, fear an "economic breakdown" if the truth about 9/11 is revealed. Griffin replies that the only thing worse than an economic collapse would be an ecological collapse, caused by global warming or a nuclear winter following nuclear war, which are unfortunately two likely scenarios with the Bush administration.

In the opinion of many, myself included, the most debilitating blow to the 9/11 truth movement is dealt by people like Noam Chomsky, who says the evidence against a U.S. government conspiracy is "overwhelming,"[22] quite consistently with his stand over the years against (non-government) conspiracy. How can one listen to this eminent, and without question brilliant and learned, scholar say this and not feel it must be true, or if not completely true at least so close to the truth that it must be taken very, very seriously? Who can say, and still feel comfortable about it, that this is utter nonsense, or an out and out lie? It reduces me, or elevates me, take it as you will, to blank verse.[23]

---

[18] See http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/wtc/bombing93/smirkingchimp_securacom.html.

[19] See http://www.911blogger.com/node/2933.

[20] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2001_anthrax_attacks.

[21] See http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8119854514684528700#.

[22] See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LoDqDvbgeXM&NR.

[23] See "Noam," in this volume.

The only reasonable explanation for the ostrich-like attitude of people like Chomsky, and many of the politicians and media elites, is that they are perfectly well aware of the transparent nature of 9/11, just as they were of the JFK assassination. Shortly after Oliver Stone's *JFK* came out, Ted Kennedy was interviewed and made the comment, "I think you'll find in the end that the Warren Commission was the most responsible party." What did he mean by that? Honest? No. Truthful? No. "Responsible" most likely in the same sense that the highest priority for the U.S. government regarding 9/11 is not to reveal the truth but to prevent a general "breakdown." A secondary but also high priority may well be physical self-preservation (remember Paul Wellstone[24]), or at the least preservation of your reputation and access to public attention and the media. A "conspiracy theorist," unless his name happens to be George Bush, is automatically "outrageous" and a kook, no longer to be taken seriously by the mainstream media or, our rulers hope, by anyone else.

Even if we have a thousand different answers to the question of the identity of the Mysterious Secret Forces behind U.S. government power, we know they transcend the current administration. Fletcher Prouty, with whom I enjoyed an extended correspondence, originally put his finger on "the CIA and Its Allies in Control of the United States and the World," as he subtitled his 1972 book *The Secret Team*, but he was never able or cared to name any of the members of this team outside the CIA except T. V. Soong and Averell Harriman. In his second book *JFK: The CIA, Vietnam and the Plot to Assassinate John F. Kennedy* he used Churchill's expression "High Cabal," and in his letters to me[25] explicitly exonerated the CIA, whom he had apparently come to think of as merely the tools of the High Cabal. My reaction to that was the same as my reaction to all of the Mysterious Evil Forces theories: if the cops are corrupt (the tools of darker forces), you go after the cops. Why? Because we know who the cops are, and we have (theoretically, at least) legal procedures by which to challenge them.

It must have become clear by now why I said in "A Reply to *Time*" that Big Brother has made it relatively easy for us by dividing reality into only two worlds rather than three or four, or indeed an infinite number, depending on how many theories of Mysterious Evil Forces one wishes to entertain. This is, in fact, all we need to understand the world, as long as we also understand that the demon we are confronted with in world no. 2 is not limited to the Bush administration, or the CIA. George W. Bush did not kill JFK, even though there is some evidence that his father was involved,[26] and the neocons could never have pulled off what they have pulled off without the consent of a higher power, a power great enough to silence the mainstream political opposition and news media.

The Kennedy family, as exemplified by the quote above from Teddy, have acquiesced to the murder of two of their shining sons by this Power Elite (to use yet another phrase, this one coined by C. Wright Mills), but lest anyone forget, the King family did not. They got their trial,[27] albeit a mere civil suit for $100 in damages against Lloyd Jowers for violating MLK's civil rights, but the point is, it was established in a court of law that this was done by way of murdering him, in a conspiracy involving not only the minor player Jowers but also the United States government.

> THE COURT: In answer to the question did Lloyd Jowers participate in a conspiracy to do harm to Dr. Martin Luther King, your answer is yes. Do you also find that others, including governmental agencies, were parties to this conspiracy as alleged by the defendant? Your answer to that one is also yes. And the total amount of damages you find for the plaintiffs entitled to is one hundred dollars. Is that your verdict?
>
> THE JURY: Yes (In unison).

Now, if you have a conspiracy to murder a citizen of a country, and one who is a dissident and potentially revolutionary leader besides (MLK had come out against the Vietnam war the year before, at about the same time as Robert Kennedy, who was murdered under equally suspicious circumstances the same summer), who do you think had to be the leader of that conspiracy?

---

[24] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Wellstone.

[25] See *Correspondence with Vincent Salandria*, 2007.

[26] See Webster Tarpley's *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography* http://tarpley.net/online-books/george-bush-the-unauthorized-biography/ and more recently Russ Baker's *Family of Secrets* (2008).

[27] See https://www.thekingcenter.org/KingCenter/Transcript_trial_info.aspx.

The King family got what they wanted, which was a trial and a verdict that said, not literally and not legally but in effect, that the government murdered MLK. It is totally inconsequential that obvious government agents like Gerald Posner immediately inundated the mass media with articles assuring the public that this was only a civil suit, not a criminal trial, so the standard of proof was much lower ("preponderance of evidence" vs. "beyond a reasonable doubt"). Furthermore, the U.S. government was not on trial, so whatever was said in the verdict about government complicity had no legal standing. Posner extended this, with unabashed legal sophistry, to imply "no factual standing," since legally speaking, the guilt of the government, as opposed to the guilt of Lloyd Jowers, had not been established as a fact. This is like saying that it may be established that X killed Y at a certain time of day (amongst many other incriminating pieces of evidence), and that may then be considered a "fact," but strictly (legally) speaking, the "fact" that the murder occurred at a particular time is not a "fact" because that "fact" was not the issue that was adjudicated. The argument that in a criminal trial more such evidence must be accumulated to prove guilt than in a civil trial does not make any individual piece of that evidence (such as the time of day or the complicity of the U.S. government in a murder conspiracy) less "factual" or less true. This was the interpretation given to the trial as a whole by Posner, however, and to be honest, I have yet to find a lawyer who will accept my common-sense point of view.

Nevertheless, I am quite sure that my interpretation is the same as that of the King family, and that this was their purpose in pursuing the trial. I think it was also a consolation on the part of Big Brother, who after all could have quashed the trial the same way he quashed the Garrison trial of Clay Shaw in 1969. It was, I think, a way of saying to the King family (and to all of Black America and anyone else who was interested): "Ok, we did it, and here's your proof, or as much as you're going to get. So much for your historical record. Now forget it." It is what the spooks call a limited hangout, and it seems to have worked. At least, the brothers are no longer rioting, are they?

There is a streak of honesty in Big Brother. "Honesty" is the wrong word, of course, because he uses it as a tool of control, but it is "honest" in the sense that the truth, that is, part of the truth, is often the best way to lie. The spooks, I believe, call this "white propaganda." The transparency of "super-crimes" like the assassination(s) and 9/11 is of course the whitest propaganda, as explained in "Transparency Theory." For those who require something more concrete, we have things like the Jowers trial. It is not very far from that sort of limited hangout to the only slightly disguised confession that *Time* offered us – namely, that we have two choices, with them or against them, "them" meaning quite clearly the U.S. government, and of course the Mysterious Evil Forces in control of the U.S. government, but the pretense that there is a significant difference between these two ideas is apparently no longer seen as necessary.

When Hugo Chavez held up Chomsky's book (*Hegemony or Survival*) at the UN the other day and called George Bush the devil, he was giving us the same message, in somewhat simpler terms, that David Ray Griffin gives us in *Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11*. It is not that Bush himself, or Cheney or Rumsfeld or Wolfowitz, is the devil, but that these people, and unfortunately the government they control, are serving the devil. Whether we take our terminology from the bible, Orwell, Mills, Prouty, or Dwight Eisenhower (the "military-industrial-complex"), in the end we are talking about what I think Griffin describes best as "demonic power."

This is a spiritual concept, but not an abstraction. Abstractions do not shoot presidents, start wars, or fly planes (or missiles) into buildings (or blow them up and make us think planes hit them). People do these things, and of course it is essential to find out whether these people are working primarily out of caves in Afghanistan or out of Langley, Virginia (for example). Thanks to the work of Griffin and many other 9/11 researchers, we are beyond that. The evidence, to use Chomsky's word but to come to a conclusion diametrically opposite from his, is "overwhelming" that the Bush administration, ridden by the same demonic imperialistic impulses that have plagued humanity for millenia, orchestrated 9/11.

As Griffin says, just as "the American empire plays an explanatory role with regard to 9/11," 9/11 reveals that the U.S. global domination project "is propelled by fanaticism based on a deeply perverted value system" (p. 183). So it is important to keep spreading the word about 9/11, whether the culprits are brought to justice or not. In the larger picture, Griffin and Chomsky, disagree as they might on the nature of the 9/11 conspiracy, agree fully on the nature of imperialism, and particularly U.S. imperialism. Griffin has made a major contribution, I think, in putting the struggle against imperialism in a spiritual light:

> …the battle between divine power and demonic power is a real battle, which means that the outcome is not predetermined…
>
> Insofar as we accept the idea that the divine purposes can be threatened by creaturely power, we can maintain our definition of the demonic – that it is creaturely power that, besides being strong enough to threaten divine purposes, is exercised in ways that are diametrically opposed to those purposes. From this perspective, we must conclude that the United States is today the chief embodiment of demonic power.
>
> This perspective, to be sure, requires an enormous shift in our understanding of the relation between our country and our God. Most Americans who believe in God have been brought up assuming that America is at least basically on God's side, perhaps even the chief instrument of divine purposes in the world. To go from that understanding to the view that our country is instead the chief embodiment of demonic power, hence the primary threat to divine purposes on our planet, is not an enjoyable conversion. But it is, I believe, a conversion that is necessary if our beliefs are to correspond to reality and if we are to be in position to turn our country, and hence our world, in a different direction (p. 180).

Rome wasn't built in a day, and the Roman Empire wasn't deconstructed in a day either. Jesus, whom Griffin (and others) convincingly portrays as an anti-imperialist revolutionary, did his bit, but it is clear that we have to be in this for the long haul. This is the attitude we need to keep fighting, and not to give in to Big Brother's transparency ("shock and awe") strategy, while also recognizing the immensity and long-term nature of the struggle we are engaged in.

It is too easy to say the truth about 9/11 will never come out. We might say so, when we consider that the truth about the assassination of JFK (and others) will never come out either, but if we understand the nature of Big Brother/the Devil, we must also understand that the truth is not something we should look for in government documents or the *New York Times*. The truth about 9/11 IS out, and readily and amply available to anyone who can use the internet or walk into a bookstore (or watch a very rare broadcast on C-Span). What we can do with that truth, as Salandria (see "Transparency Theory") and Griffin have told us, is try to understand the world. That will certainly not lead to an immediate spiritual revolution – and here is where the notion of faith comes in – but it can help us figure out what to do to prevent the most immediate disasters.

A war on Iran, for example, with or without a nuclear first strike, must be prevented at all costs. Impeachment may be a "left-gatekeeper meme," but if it would keep George II from attacking Iran (U.S. troops are already reported to be operating inside Iran), it must be done. Let us hope the Democrats gain control of Congress in November – and work towards getting that done – so that impeachment will become a realistic possibility.

Back to Ground Zero

March 11, 2008

I am almost ashamed to see that it has been a year and a half since I wrote "The Onion Peeled," which ends on the optimistic note that Bush and Cheney might be impeached if the Democrats won the 2006 elections.

That optimism was born of desperation, because I felt the danger of another, and worse, 9/11 false flag event was imminent at that time. The fact that it did not occur, and the fact that the Democrats won that election, subsequently gaining control of the Senate as well as the House, coupled with the immediate declaration by the party leaders that impeachment was "off the table," makes it clear why we were spared a second "new Pearl Harbor" and, so far at least, war with Iran.

The Democrats are in control: *damage* control. There can be no better evidence that the Democrats and the Republicans are merely the left and right hands of the devil than what has happened since the 2006 election – namely, nothing. This extends in perfect continuity to the coming 2008 election, which has been predictably narrowed down to three candidates – McCain, Clinton and Obama – who have made it quite clear that the neocon "war on terror," that is, the politics of fear, the pursuit of manufactured enemies and the expansion of the police state, will continue as planned, though perhaps at a less frenetic pace. There will be no prosecution of the crimes of the Bush administration, and no real investigation of 9/11. There will be more wars and, if necessary, more 9/11s to justify them. The concentration camps[28] for dissidents, i.e. "potential terrorists," are already being built.

This is the scenario that all the factions of the powers-that-be have accepted. Whether they all accept it because they believe in it or because they are afraid not to doesn't make a lot of difference. There is obviously some disagreement in their ranks over "tactics," however; otherwise we would be even farther down the road to the Brave New World of fascism, perpetual war, Total Information Awareness and slavery than the Bush gang has taken us.

What we have gained, in other words, is a bit of time, a small window of hope. I say "we" because there can be no doubt that the dissension among the powerful that has put the brakes on the neo-con march to tyranny has been caused by popular protest on two fronts – 9/11 truth and antiwar. The politics of fear does work both ways. There is one thing that our controllers fear, and that is the spread of ideas and subsequent mass action that they cannot control. Everything is about control. If one does not believe in democracy, one must believe in control. There is nothing in between.

I said that I am "almost" ashamed of not following up until now what I wrote in "The Onion Peeled." It's not as if I have been totally inactive. I started a couple of Yahoo groups (911truthcoalition and davidraygriffin) which, who knows, may help to keep some channels of communication open. Getting people to do things, though, does not seem to be my forte. The one serious action I attempted to promote with 911truthcoalition – getting as many 9/11 truth groups as possible to support impeachment and join with as many anti-war sites as possible to do the same – failed. Even within this group, a divisive argument immediately ensued as to how this goal should be pursued and whether it should be pursued at all. I still do not understand how some can argue that because impeachment is not a panacea, or even realistic, it should not be tried.

Worse, I am suspicious of such arguments. How can one lament the loss of democracy and at the same time refuse to even attempt to use one of the remaining tools the people have to assert themselves? What level of cynicism and hopelessness does this require? Or is it something worse, namely prevarication and complicity? By the same token, I am suspicious of arguments, coming mostly from the "left" (e.g., Noam Chomsky), that even though Washington, D.C. is the center of international terrorism there is no evidence of high-level complicity in acts of terror such as 9/11. Nor can I put any credence in arguments, these coming primarily from the "right," that the terrorists in Washington are merely the handmaidens of Israel or Zionist bankers. I have been repeatedly astounded by how widespread such thinking is in the 9/11 "truth movement," and again, I am highly suspicious for the simple and eminently transparent reason that any whiff of anti-Semitism is the surest way for any "movement" to destroy itself.

Another thing that I have done since September 2006 is publish two books comprised of things I wrote prior to 9/11, most of which is still available piecemeal on the internet. These are *Looking for the Enemy* (2008)

---

[28] See http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=8258.

and *Correspondence with Vincent Salandria* (2007), both available as books on amazon.com. I doubt that many "9/11 truthers" will purchase these books, precisely because they were written prior to 9/11, but there is one point I want to emphasize because I think it may provide some perspective for people who have become "radicalized," to use a word from the 60s, for the first time. This includes not only younger people, but also older people of very diverse backgrounds, such as Bob McIlvaine, David Griffin, Ray McGovern, Paul Craig Roberts, Steven Jones, Morgan Reynolds, etc., just to name a few prominent ones, but the list could be expanded to include literally tens of millions of people who, prior to 9/11, would never have entertained for a moment the thought that their own government would be capable of such turpitude. Needless to say, that same bedrock of belief, which David Griffin calls nationalist faith and rightly, I think, interprets as having replaced religious faith in many minds, is the crucial element that keeps the truth about 9/11 from reaching even more than the approximately one third or even one half of the population it has already reached.

If we are to mobilize enough of the population to force political change, we must fight this psychological/"religious" battle. We cannot simply wait until "enough" (whatever that critical mass might be) people wake up. If we do, we might well find ourselves waking up with them in one of Kellog, Brown and Root's concentration camps.

An important part of this psychological war is avoiding burn-out. This is a real danger. It helps to understand that other people, many more than we suspect, have been down exactly the same dark path we are treading. For example, when I realized the truth about the JFK assassination, quite abruptly in November 1988, it was hard to appreciate the fact that some people, like Vincent Salandria, had felt the way I had just begun to feel for almost a quarter of a century. One thinks that one is discovering a new world, and that is exactly what is happening, except that it is the same old world being seen in a radically different light. The lies, the treachery, the brutality, the immorality, the *evil* that has always been there becomes revealed to us, and that process of discovery, once begun, is difficult to stop (though denial is encouraged by the mass media). There is a steep learning curve. I have learned much, much more about the world, about reality, since November 1988 than I ever learned in the previous 42 years. (The catalyst, in my case, was the supremely banal event of watching a TV documentary about the JFK assassination, which I have tried to describe in a poem.[29])

As an illustration of what I am trying to say here, I want to quote from my correspondence with Vincent Salandria, who was the first person (even before Mark Lane) to challenge the Warren Report (in 1965). This hardly qualifies as a premonition, but nevertheless I find it striking that the expression I chose in 1996 to describe the condition I had found myself in, and that I shared with Salandria and a dozen other correspondents, and perhaps even with thousands of other Americans was *Ground Zero*. Now I think it is fair to say that millions of Americans have joined us at "Ground Zero," as I described it seven years before 9/11.

> (3/26/96)
>
> I know you are a reluctant hero, Vince, but I submit that you, being one of the first denizens of what I call Ground Zero, and the very first person in the universe to systematically attack the Warren Report in print, are indeed, without question and with emphasis, a hero.
>
> Not only for that, though. This correspondence is your child, yours alone. How many of us would do it, even if we too were multimillionaires, or maybe I should say especially if we were? How many of us would so kindly and indulgently respond, with never a harsh word for anyone, except in jest, and sign our letters "love," and mean it?
>
> Why is our correspondence – over a foot high sitting on my desk now, and growing more or less bi-monthly – so important? It is the first literature of Ground Zero. This is the new age, I suspect the first significant change of consciousness in post-mortem America (which began on 11/22/63). You and the 100,000 others you say also knew were the first to occupy this landscape, and you were the first to explore it. It's quite fitting, then, that you are now the father – mother if you prefer – but in any case the creator and sustainer of the first coherent body of literature dealing with what you call the Macroanalysis.
>
> I prefer "Ground Zero" because for me the word "analysis" sounds too scientific – not that I think we are unscientific but for me, science, and scholarship of any kind, are not enough to deal with the situation we are in.
>
> … You [here I am addressing another member of the group, "John Thomas," a businessman and Vietnam vet, who prefers to remain anonymous] are right to say debate is a reflection of friendship and trust, and we

[29] See "Butcher Shop," in this volume.

cannot have debate with secrecy. It [secrecy] destroys everything, and to the extent that they [government apologists] convince us that we need it, for our "own good," we destroy ourselves. Secrecy is the enemy of freedom, trust, communication, understanding, curiosity, and love. In accepting it, we diminish our humanity. In fighting it, we are fighting for our humanity.

In a sense, even the most abject medieval peasant was freer and more enlightened than we are, because at least he knew who he was, and who the princes were, and how they related to each other. Can we say as much? I don't think so. We are essentially trying to figure out who is calling the shots, who is running the world, and we all have our own ideas about it. This is not the kind of curiosity I referred to above, which is the curiosity of science and art, man reflecting on and trying to come to terms with his existential condition. What we are left with is a much less noble curiosity – about other people and their secret machinations, their intrigues – and it is short-lived because we just get tired of it. We get tired of the shell game, as you put it. It is quintessentially boring to try to follow all the different ways the thugs and con men are screwing us, and it's their game. We can't win. We have to refuse to play.

That is the great contribution that our group can make. We can show others, first by showing ourselves, how it is possible to live and fight for our humanity at what I call Ground Zero, you call the other side of the looking glass (that is, reality), and Vince calls the level of the Macroanalysis. It's not easy. We can't just walk away from it as we would a shell game on the street. We are fully caught up in it, and are part of it, because this web of lies and manipulation is what our world has become. It is no longer a simple and transparent matter of the princes telling the peasants what to do. They have got us thinking we are little princes too, and to some extent I guess we are. The important thing is that we see our predicament as clearly as possible and fight against it. We do that every time we write to each other. It is not "mental masturbation" – or if it is, so what? We can't all fuck the princess, but if we can imagine doing so, what's wrong with that?

11/16/96

… [addressing Vince again] And who are they [Noam Chomsky, Alexander Cockburn, Edward Jay Epstein]? The left hand of Big Brother, I'm afraid. This is a harder truth to face, I think, than the others – the truth about the coup, the media, AIDS, or what have you. The longer it stays with me, the more important I think it is. When you have been disabused of all the lies but this one, you've been marginalized but you still have a niche, the same one that Chomsky et al. occupy. Take that away and what have you got? Ground Zero.

5/19/97

… I am not as sure as you are that there is no mole among us. It is in Big Brother's interest to keep track of us, precisely because we are cutting edge. We are the candles in the garden, and there are damned few. Either we are all really nuts, or Big Brother is a reality. Dallas tells us Big Brother is real. Chomsky says Dallas tells us nothing – and that is how we know he is lying. Given that BB is real, then, it is only logical that he would like to see where our thinking leads us. Of course he must make sure none of our little candles become beacons. But it also behooves him to keep track of us in order to learn what to expect from others, later, when others hit Ground Zero. How can the people down here be best controlled?

… I don't want that to happen, but the only way I know to prevent it is to continue doing what we're doing. I'm not going to get paranoid about moles. But we cannot live here, at Ground Zero, and not know they are around, and that they can turn up in the most unpredictable places. The only thing we can do is talk. We cannot look behind each other's backs and see who has his fingers crossed. Talk is all we've got. A certain amount of mutual suspicion is bound to come up, and I fully agree that we should deal with it forthrightly whenever it does, and try to fight like gentlemen. When we stop doing that, it's war.

11/14/99

In one of your previous letters [here I am addressing "John Thomas" again] (I'm not going to fish it out now) you seemed to be giving in to what Vince was trying to get you to accept – that it was an institutional killing – but you were obviously quite peeved and upset at being "forced" into it. You felt that Vince and the rest of us were not listening to you closely enough, that we were stubbornly refusing to see what for you was a very clear and simple distinction. But you were – reluctantly and angrily – willing to accept our point of view. This was Anger winning out over Patriotism, and the anger you were expressing in your letter was anger that probably would eventually have been redirected to its proper target (U.S. government institutions). But after that letter, it appears that Patriotism came back strong and took control again.

I know you will think this is a ridiculous oversimplification. But I have been there. Have you? I'm talking about the true loss of patriotism. The state of mind of not being proud of being an American, and in fact being

ashamed of being an American. The state of saying, "No, I will not fight for this country." I called this Ground Zero.

Now, I'm not saying I'm there all the time. It can be quite a depressing place. It is a depressing place. It is inhabited by people like Vince, Marty, Ralph, and me (I haven't heard enough from the others to tell). Our message to the world is not encouraging. I believe you are there, too, but with only one foot on the ground. (In the grave, part of you is saying.) The other foot is trying to lift off with that patriotic balloon. I don't think it's going to work. I think you will be better off if you let that balloon go, as we have. It won't hold us anymore. None of us are lightweights anymore. At least here you will be among friends. That's why our group exists.

Our situations are very similar. Once upon a time we were clean-cut kids and patriots. Then came the war. I became a disaffected patriot in time to avoid direct participation, you didn't, but you ended up in the same position after you were freed from the military machine.

Then came JFK. For you it was the Stone movie, in 1991. That's what you told me in Washington. It blew your mind. I understood that, because exactly that had happened to me when I saw the Turner film on TV on Nov. 30, 1988. It was a very dramatic and emotional experience, getting my head turned around like that in the course of a single evening. I think it must be similar to the experience of combat. I mean, what happens to that force of patriotism inside us when a friend's head gets blown open right in front of us? That's patriotism? Patriotism is worth that?

My point is a simple one, and not new, but worth repeating. Our struggle is ancient, and we must carry it forward.. It has gone under many names, and still does. Some of them are false. It is entirely up to us to read the writing on the wall each time it appears, and follow the right flags. Who are the true "freedom fighters," the true seekers of peace, truth, and justice? The assassins of 9/11 and the assassins of JFK (RFK, MLK, etc.) will claim that they are. We cannot both be right. There is such a thing as right and wrong. That is my "faith." We shall overcome, simply because there is no alternative.

Let me add a note of optimism. I think we are living in a crucial time. The message of Dealey Plaza 1963 may have been transparent to a few, but the message of 9/11 has become transparent to many. The message is, "Lasciate ogni speranza, voi ch'entrate," or as I put it earlier, "We've got you by the balls."[30] This message is devastating, of course, precisely as it is meant to be, but we must remember that it is a lie. No matter how true it may seem, it is a lie. It was Dante who wrote those discouraging words over the gate to hell, not God, not the Devil, and it was some Nazi hack who had the bright idea of writing "Jedem das Seine" ("Everybody gets what he deserves") into the iron gate at Buchenwald,[31] so that it could be read from the inside.

Analogous with these messages is the message of 9/11, I'm afraid. This is the most logical way to understand the obvious unanswered questions, lies, contradictions, impossibilities, flagrant cover-up, etc.: *they want us to know*. We do know. Millions, tens of millions, of us know, or are within a hair's breadth of knowing. That is precisely the point: We know, and we are therefore also supposed to know there is nothing we can do about it. The more incredible the facts, the more blatant the lies, the more we are convinced that we are helpless. There is nothing new about the technique of the Big Lie[32] or, as it was called in U.S. advertising circles as early as 1928, the "philosophy of futility."[33] These techniques work. They are tried and effective.

It is not true that we are helpless, that all resistance is futile. This is a lie. No matter how true it may seem, it is a lie, and this is what we have to remember. It would have been much, much harder to remember this in Buchenwald or Auschwitz, and this, too, we must remember.

---

[30] See "Transparency Theory," in this volume.

[31] See "Sunrise at Buchenwald," in this volume.

[32] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_Lie.

[33] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_futility.

MITOP and the Double Bind

March 15, 2008

I want to elaborate somewhat on the idea of transparent conspiracy,[34] lest the idea seem too big to chew. It is chewable, but it takes a little work. Even though I have been chewing on it for some time, I am only now arriving at the conclusion, as I pointed out in "Back to Ground Zero," that the theory is correct.

First of all, let's give it a name that will itself be more transparent: MITOP. We are familiar with LIHOP (Let It Happen On Purpose) and MIHOP (Made It Happen On Purpose). Now we have "Made It Transparent On Purpose."

What do so many people now think 9/11 was an inside job? Because there are so many reasons to think so? Yes – for all of those reasons, and for one more that not so many people may have thought of: we are *supposed* to think so. The perpetrators, the people on the inside (Orwell's "Inner Party") *want* us to think so.

This is not as much of a leap from MIHOP as one might think, just as the leap from LIHOP to MIHOP is not as big as it used to be. In fact, as has been often pointed out, there is no dichotomy or any real difference between LIHOP and MIHOP. There is just a logical extension of degree of guilt, the difference in degree being completely negligible when we are talking about the highest authorities in the land, the most powerful military and intelligence forces in the world. When these most powerful forces allow a crime to be committed, they are not criminally negligent; they are perpetrators.

The distance from MIHOP to MITOP is even less distinct. Once MIHOP has penetrated our red-blooded American minds, MITOP cannot be far behind, if reason and common sense are our guides. The question that must keep coming to mind as we are confronted with fact after astounding fact, lie after lie, contradiction after contradiction, is "How can they have been so stupid?" I mean, really. Could they really have thought that *we* would be so stupid as to believe the 571-page lie[35] the 9/11 Commission foisted on us? Could *they* have been stupid enough to think that we would be so stupid, at least for very long? They must have known the 9/11 "truth movement" would be inevitable. How could they possibly have been clever enough to do what they did, and yet be so stupid as to think they could keep all the gaping holes in the official story from being exposed?

The simplest and most logical answer to this is that they were not that stupid. On the contrary, they wanted us to know. They have always wanted us – at least those of us who are not yet fully lobotomized by the mainstream propaganda – to know that they can do whatever they want to with us, which includes not only 9/11 but also jamming a ridiculous and totally incredible fairytale down our throats. They want us to know, very clearly but without having to come out and say it explicitly (this may come if martial law is imposed), as I have put it more bluntly earlier, that they've got us by the balls (short hairs for the politically correct).

I have discussed "Stupidity Theory" in an earlier essay. This keeps floating to the surface, it seems, as the catch-all explanation for all troubling questions. Thus we have rejection of the "inside job" thesis on the grounds that the government (and in particular the current president) is too stupid to have pulled it off. This is not very different, if at all, from the official theory of what actually happened, namely that the government is too stupid to have prevented it or stopped it while it was in progress, 19 Arabs with box cutters being just too much for the most sophisticated air defense system in the history of the universe. They just couldn't "connect the dots." *Was too stupid*, I mean, of course, since now Homeland Security and the perpetual War on Terror have made everyone much smarter.

This pattern of Stupidity continues as we progress from LIHOP to MIHOP. We must assume, given either of these scenarios, that the Insiders were just too stupid to have pulled off 9/11 any better than they did. Yeah, they were able to bring down those buildings, maybe with secret high-tech weaponry, but they just couldn't get old Ted Olson to get his story straight, Cheney to get his story straight, the military to get their story straight, couldn't get the names of the hijackers on the flight manifests, couldn't get enough debris at the crash sites to look realistic, couldn't make holes in the Pentagon walls that would look realistic, couldn't keep the BBC from announcing that WTC 7 had fallen 26 minutes before the fact, couldn't produce a whitewashed Commission Report that would fool a ten-year-old, etc., etc. – in short, couldn't do *anything* right but instead produced a mountain of evidence pointing directly to an inside job.

---

[34] See "Transparency Theory," in this volume.

[35] See http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20050523112738404.

Is this credible? Are we going to fall for Stupidity Theory once again? Are we going to be even more stupid than the 9/11 Commission (although stupidity cannot explain their failure either)? Are we going to say that we, too, cannot connect the dots? Are we going to ignore the obvious logical conclusion that people diabolically smart enough to pull off 9/11 would certainly have been smart enough to cover their tracks better than they did, smart enough not to leave so many screaming questions unanswered, *if they had wanted to*?

Common sense tells us that this degree of bungling is unlikely, and that they wanted us to know that they could do it and get away with it. Is this not precisely what has happened? Tens of millions of people do "know," despite the official story and the mainstream cover-up, that 9/11 was an inside job. And has there been a real investigation as a result? Have any of the Bush gang been impeached or indicted, or even subpoenaed, much less punished? Have the docile lap dogs in Congress or the mainstream press showed any sign of life, any sign that they are willing to do what they are supposed to do? No. And let's be honest. Is this situation likely to change? Once Bush and Co. are out of office and we have a Clinton or Obama or McCain as president, who can claim, credibly enough, that they had nothing to do with it, will the truth be any more likely to emerge "officially"?

From the point of view of the perpetrators, 9/11 has been a success. MITOP has been successful. We have a "non-consensus reality" that Lev Grossman[36] (*Time*, Sept. 3, 2006) correctly depicts as World No. 1 and World No. 2: Official Conspiracy Theory (OCT) and MITOP exist side by side. What this really means is that we are farther down the road to doublethink than we have ever been as a nation. Preemptive and perpetual war is peace. Torture is humane. Fear is security. Constraint is freedom. Tyranny is democracy. Occupation is liberation. Violations of the Constitution are legal. This is the world we live in now.

Let us analyze more closely the mind-control operations that have brought us to this point of insanity. OCT is the *Big Lie*, a well-known technique known as such at least since Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf* [37]

> In this they ["the Jews"] proceeded on the sound principle that the magnitude of a lie always contains a certain factor of credibility, since the great masses of the people in the very bottom of their hearts tend to be corrupted rather than consciously and purposely evil, and that, therefore, in view of the primitive simplicity of their minds they more easily fall a victim to a big lie than to a little one, since they themselves lie in little things, but would be ashamed of lies that were too big. Such a falsehood will never enter their heads and they will not be able to believe in the possibility of such monstrous effrontery and infamous misrepresentation in others; yes, even when enlightened on the subject, they will long doubt and waver, and continue to accept at least one of these causes as true. Therefore, something of even the most insolent lie will always remain and stick – a fact which all the great lie-virtuosi and lying-clubs in this world know only too well and also make the most treacherous use of.

The same Wikipedia article I have taken this quote from notes how Walter C. Langer of the OSS (precursor of the CIA), in his psychological profile of Hitler, correctly understood the technique:

> …people will believe a big lie sooner than a little one; and if you repeat it frequently enough people will sooner or later believe it.

It can readily be seen how the tale of Osama bin Laden and his 19 box-cutter-carrying hijackers making fools out of the U.S. Air Force qualifies as a Big Lie.

MITOP is essentially the same technique, reversed. The mirror image of Big Lie is the *Big Truth*. This is an even better-established principle of psychological warfare. In more general terms, in sports, for example, it is known as *demoralizing* one's opponent. We know it from the 2003 invasion of Iraq as *Shock and Awe*. The goal of this strategy is to convince the enemy of this indelible point: "We are so much more powerful and ruthless than you are that you might as well surrender." The formal term is "rapid dominance," introduced in 1996 at the National Defense University by Harlan Ullman and James Wade,[38] who say the purpose of this doctrine is to

---

[36] See "A Reply to *Time*."

[37] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_Lie.

[38] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shock_and_awe.

> impose this overwhelming level of Shock and Awe against an adversary on an immediate or sufficiently timely basis to paralyze its will to carry on"[to] seize control of the environment and paralyze or so overload an adversary's perceptions and understanding of events that the enemy would be incapable of resistance at the tactical and strategic levels.

The Wikipedia author continues:

> Shock and awe is most consistently used by Ullman and Wade as the effect which rapid dominance seeks to impose upon an adversary. It is the desired state of helplessness and lack of will. It can be induced, they write, by direct force applied to command and control centers, selective denial of information and dissemination of disinformation, overwhelming combat force, and rapidity of action.

Thus we have two well-known propaganda techniques which are mirror images of each other – the Big Lie based on a lie which is so big it must be believed, and the Big Truth (Shock and Awe) based on a truth that is so big it must believed, either one of which would be effective on its own.

Of course our leaders don't admit to using the Big Lie at all, because we're the good guys (except in the case of the attack on the U.S.S Maine, Pearl Harbor, the Gulf of Tonkin, etc.). The Big Truth, however, as we've seen, is perfectly acceptable. When both techniques are used together, the result could be described as a *binary* weapon, whose combined effect is even more devastating than either weapon used alone.

The battleground, we must remember, is our own heads. The Big Lie, the Official Conspiracy Theory expounded by the *9/11 Commission Report*, raises the general level of anxiety and insecurity by conjuring an ever-present but unidentified "Terrorist" threat, but has no serious pathological effect. It's Us against Them (whoever and wherever they are).

MITOP is the real wolf at the door, because this threat is not outside but inside with us. Rather, he is both inside and outside, since both OCT and MITOP (Grossman's two worlds) co-exist.

MITOP is particularly threatening to Americans, because our mass culture inculcates so strongly in us that our government is "good." People in many other countries are much less convinced of the inherent goodness of their governments, and therefore more easily accept the idea that their leaders are, or can be, their enemies. Italians, to take a western example, while remaining "proud Italians," would not necessarily fall apart or even be surprised to learn that their government is full of lying, murderous scoundrels. We Americans, however, are conditioned to identify with our government, and since MITOP identifies the government as the Enemy, it is tantamount to the fully schizophrenic view of Ourselves as the Enemy, the inimical Other. As long as we actually believe the government is democratic – which it most certainly is not – we will have this problem.

From the perpetrators' viewpoint, the illusion of democracy works perfectly to maintain the schizophrenia that results from the coexistence of the two contradictory worlds of OCT and MITOP. Why is this good – for them? Orwell defined *doublethink*[39] in his novel *1984* as

> The power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them". To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies.

In more clinical terms, this is what is called a *double bind:*

> The double bind is often misunderstood to be a simple Catch-22 situation, where the victim is trapped by two conflicting demands. While it is true that at the core of the double bind are two conflicting demands, the difference lies in how they are imposed upon the victim, what the victim's understanding of the situation is, and who imposes these demands upon the victim. Unlike the usual no-win situation, the victim is largely

[39] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doublethink.

> unaware of the exact nature of the paradoxical situation he or she is in. This is because a demand is imposed upon them by someone they regard with respect, and the demand itself is inherently impossible to fulfill.[40]

Doublethink can be thought of as the endpoint of the double bind, the point of no return, of complete insanity. One is not just schizoid but stark raving mad.

The double bind is created by the conflicting demands imposed on us by OCT and MITOP. Both theories emanate from people we respect. The anti-OCT people have much more trouble establishing their respectability than the OCT supporters, of course, but I think it is fair to say by now that this has happened. There are scholars for 9/11 truth, pilots for 9/11 truth, architects and engineers for 9/11 truth, veterans for 9/11 truth, students for 9/11 truth, "patriots" for 9/11 truth, movie stars for 9/11 truth, etc. We have respectable sources on both sides. Yet we know that both sides can *not* be correct.

Lev Grossman treats this as a lack of "consensus reality," as if it were a disagreement over a truly insoluble question, thus granting a degree of legitimacy to both "worlds," as he puts it, even though he obviously favors World No. 1. If he actually believes this, he is deeply schizophrenic. He is caught in a double bind, and since he does not know how to get out of it, he is helpless and completely disempowered.

This is precisely the goal of these mind-control strategies – to make all of us feel helpless. In order for the few to control the many, they (the few) must either use physical force or psychological force. The latter, historically, has proven more effective. Noam Chomsky has often pointed out how concepts like "manufacturing consent" and the "philosophy of futility" have originated in the constant struggle of the "political class" (in Orwell's terms, the "Inner Party") to control the "rabble" (us):

> When you have a formal democratic system, when people have won rights after years of struggle, like the right to vote and participate in elections, you have to take the risk out of democracy by ensuring that there is very little substance to their democratic choices.
>
> This is done by organising the world so that the major decisions are not in the public arena. And by imposing on the people - I am now quoting from manuals of the public relations industry - a "philosophy of futility". This is done so that the attention of the people is focussed on the superficial things of life like fashionable consumption.
>
> From infancy children have drilled into them, from television, advertising and in every possible way, that they have to have a "philosophy of futility" as far as serious decisions are concerned and that they have to perceive themselves as passive consumers. It does not really matter what you know about the world. The less you know, the better.
>
> That is the model. It does not work, but that is the model. The rabble never accepts this. It continually resists and struggles against this. That also requires the use of other techniques to try and control people. The elite media are mostly directed to the small decision-making sector - people who make choices in decisions that run society. They have to be properly indoctrinated by not just the media but by the education system and everything else. The true mass media that go to the general audience, they mostly distract, making people pay attention to something else – popular music, purchasing.[41]

Paul Nystrom[42] was talking in 1928 about keeping people feeling helpless so they would be good consumers:

> One's outlook on life and its purposes may greatly modify one's attitude toward goods in which fashion is prominent. At the present time, not a few people in western nations have departed from old-time standards of religion and philosophy, and having failed to develop forceful views to take their places, hold to something that may be called, for want of a better name, a *philosophy of futility*. This view of life (or lack of a view of life) involves a question as to the value of motives and purposes of the main human activities. There is ever a tendency to challenge the purpose of life itself. This lack of purpose in life has an effect on consumption similar to that of having a narrow life interest, that is, in concentrating human attention on the more superficial things that comprise much of *fashionable* consumption.

---

[40] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Double_bind.

[41] *Frontline*, November, 2001: http://www.flonnet.com/fl1824/18241170.htm.

[42] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_futility.

But the same idea applies, as Chomsky says, to making and keeping people "good citizens," i.e., people who will accept the choices offered to them and not demand more.

What better way to make us feel helpless than to put us in the double bind of OCT and MITOP?

I am not a psychiatrist, but it is clear that the first thing we have to do – and I am talking now about regaining our sanity, not necessarily putting the 9/11 murderers in jail – is recognize the problem. The double bind is essentially a communication problem. 9/11 truth must out. There is only room for one reality, one world. If that leaves us with MITOP, we can deal with it, because the truth is that we are not helpless. We are only helpless if we believe we are helpless, and that is what must change.

Martin Luther King and 9/11

April 4, 2008

Today's 40th anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King provides a good opportunity to examine Newspeak in full bloom.

The question, of course, is "Did the U.S. government kill him"? The official answer is "No, a guy named Ray did it alone." The intuitive answer of a large part of the U.S. population (not to mention the rest of the world) is "Yes," and the informed answer of the King family is the title of their lawyer's 2003 book: *An Act of State* (William F. Pepper). In their own words,[43]

> a conspiracy to kill Dr. King did exist. Most significantly, this conspiracy involved agents of the governments of the City of Memphis, the state of Tennessee and the United States of America. The overwhelming weight of the evidence also indicated that James Earl Ray was not the triggerman and, in fact, was an unknowing patsy.

In the words of the judge and the jury in the Lloyd Jowers trial in 1999[44]:

> In answer to the question did Loyd Jowers participate in a conspiracy to do harm to Martin Luther King, your answer is yes. Do you also find that others, including governmental agencies, were parties to this conspiracy as alleged by the defendant? Your answer to that one is also yes.

These "governmental agencies" included, as the trial testimony shows, the FBI, CIA, and Military Intelligence. The Mafia (Carlos Marcello) was also involved.

Now, one must ask oneself which of these "agencies" would have been the leader of the conspiracy. Who would be the senior partner in a conspiracy involving the Mafia, the city of Memphis, the state of Tennessee, and the federal government? This is not a hard question. The obvious answer is what many people think anyway.

Here we have again the double bind I described in "MITOP and the Double Bind." Both "truths" cannot exist in a sane world, so we have a world (or two worlds, as Lev Grossman puts it – see "A Reply to *Time*") of doublethink, which Orwell described (in *1984*) as "the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them." What we (tens of millions of us) think, and what the U.S. government tells us, as in the case of 9/11, cannot possibly both be true.

So let's take a look at the way the Media Mafia handle this, 40 years after the fact, and 9 years after the trial that should have resolved the matter for everyone as clearly as it did for the judge and jury and the King family, who subsequently "have no doubt that the truth about this terrible event has finally been revealed."

I'll start with my local paper, the *Hessische Allgemeine*, which had a story on April 3 by an AP correspondent named Wolfgang Künzel.[45] Künzel says the 1999 trial showed that Jowers had been part of a conspiracy, was paid by the Mafia, and that Ray was not the shooter. In the very next sentence, however, instead of saying what the judge and jury said, namely that the U.S. government was also part of the conspiracy, Künzel says that *William Pepper says* that government agencies were involved in the *cover-up* (*Vertuschungsaktion*). Why? Because, *Pepper says*, King had come out against the Vietnam war and was planning the Poor People's March on Washington. (He was also planning to run for president with Benjamin Spock at the head of a broad-based anti-war coalition, as Pepper has also said, but Künzel does not mention this.)

Well, well. Duh. And what do we think of that, fellow doublethinkers, fellow inmates of the nuthouse so well tended by the "guardians of freedom" (in perfect Newspeak), the Media Mafia? Let's see. There was a conspiracy. Ray was in it. Jowers was in it. The Mafia was in it. And the government covered it up. Covered *what* up? That MLK had turned against the war (one year earlier, with the famous Riverside Church speech) and was planning a march on Washington? Well, no, that doesn't make sense, since these were public acts and part of history, then and now.

---

[43] See King family statement: https://www.thekingcenter.org/KingCenter/Transcript_trial_info.aspx.

[44] See https://www.thekingcenter.org/KingCenter/Transcript_trial_info.aspx.

[45] At the time of writing posted here: http://www.pr-inside.com/de/wer-erschoss-martin-luther-king-r515304.htm.

What has happened here is that Künzel has put the crucial words (*conspiracy*, *Mafia*, *government*, *cover-up*, etc.) together so as to perpetuate the double bind. He does not tell us what the Jowers verdict says, that the government did it, but says that *according to Pepper,* the government might have had something to do with it, meaning not the killing but the cover-up of some unspecified something. The title of the article is "Lone Gunman or Conspiracy" (*Alleintäterschaft oder Verschwörung*?), or, in the online versions, "Who Killed Martin Luther King?" The statement of the Jowers verdict is turned back into a question.

We are still insane, if we accept this, because it requires us to accept two completely incompatible ideas: what the government says (Ray did it), and what the Jowers verdict says (the government did it).

Once we understand that Künzel's purpose (perhaps without realizing it himself) is to maintain, not resolve, the double bind, it becomes clear why he could not tell us what the Jowers verdict actually says. If he had, it would have destroyed the pretense that the mystery persists. If we know who done it, we can't ask who done it, and this is where he wants us because it is probably where he is himself. You cannot have both the Jowers verdict and the Unsolved Mystery, because the former solves the latter. If the mystery is unsolved, the government may be right, and (maybe) Ray did it, and (maybe) he did it together with some Mafiosi. On the other hand, maybe Pepper is right about the government "covering up" something, although we don't know what. This is what we are supposed to (double)think, and is probably what the helpless Herr Künzel also thinks: We do not know the truth, cannot know the truth, and are therefore helpless.

Now let's look at a few examples in English, starting with the Voice of America,[46] which produces the expected propaganda hatchet job:

> Although Ray pled guilty and was convicted, years later he retracted his confession.He said he had been only a minor player in a conspiracy. But a lengthy U.S. Justice Department investigation concluded Ray had acted alone.
>
> King's family rejected those findings. Historian Michael Honey says 40 years later questions linger, especially in Memphis.

It wasn't "years" but three days later that Ray retracted his confession. The Jowers trial is not mentioned at all. The AP story (e.g., in the *International Herald Tribune*[47]) doesn't mention it either: "James Earl Ray, a petty criminal and prison escapee, pleaded guilty to the murder. He died in prison in 1998." By innuendo: he did it. Period.

ScrippsNews (Bartholomew Sullivan)[48] manages to mention Pepper's book without mentioning the Jowers trial, which is what the book is about, and refers to him as Ray's lawyer without mentioning that he was the Kings' lawyer in the Jowers (the only) trial. Pepper, says Sullivan, suggests "the [HSCA] committee overlooked evidence it collected that 'frequently conflicts with conclusions of the (committee's) report itself,'" without further explanation. Consider the astounding opacity of this statement, in contrast to the simple assertion of both Pepper's book and the Jowers trial – that the government did it.

In a way it is a relief to have to deal only with these crude attempts to suppress the Jowers verdict by ignoring it. After 40 years, this first line of defense is apparently deemed sufficient. The second line was more evident in 1999 when the trial took place, though it was hugely underreported. I have a collection of these stories, but Gerald Posner's *Washington Post* article[49] will suffice as an example.

Posner, who exposed himself to serious researchers as a government shill with his first book on the JFK murder (*Case Closed*, 1994), dismisses the entire trial as a farce, "a cynical scheme to give some official sanction to the discredited theory that the Kings enthusiastically endorse" as part of the "persistent effort of the Kings to help Pepper exonerate Ray and to charge instead that much of the federal government killed Dr. King." These references to a "discredited theory" and a "charge" come, mind you, at the very end of a 923-word article that makes no mention of the actual finding, which is neither a "theory" nor a "charge" but a verdict. Posner, as a lawyer, knows the difference, but he obviously does not want his readers to know, and cannot quote the

---

46 See http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/a-13-2008-04-03-voa29-66747282.html.

47 No longer online, for free anyway., but at the time of writing it was here: http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2008/04/03/america/NA-GEN-U.S.-King-Anniversary-Memphis.php.

48 Also apparently no longer available, but at the time of writing it was here: http://www.scrippsnews.net/node/31977.

49 At the time of writing it was here: http://www.posner.com/articles/washpostking.htm.

50 plain words of Judge Swearengen (see above) because this would make it all too plain that it is he that is the legal farce and not the perfectly legitimate trial in which 12 jurors heard 70 witnesses in three and a half weeks of testimony, concluding unanimously that the U.S. government was involved in a conspiracy to "do harm to" MLK.

The phrase "do harm" was used by the judge instead of "murder" because this was a civil suit, not a criminal trial, but there can hardly be any doubt that the harm done was to kill him. I say "hardly" because I also have no doubt that Posner – if he had thought of it – would not have hesitated to claim that this refers not to the murder but to the FBI campaign to discredit King before the murder. There was such a campaign, of course, but even the scantest glance at the trial transcript makes it clear that murder is meant, since Jowers was not involved in the FBI defamation campaign, but only in the murder.

Posner does apply his legal expertise to the distinction between civil and criminal trials in an attempt to discredit the evidence. This point was taken up by a number of other journalists as well. It's is a bit tricky, so let's look at it:

> The civil standard is only a "preponderance of the evidence" as opposed to the more stringent "beyond a reasonable doubt" of a criminal trial. And in the four-week trial that just finished in Memphis, Pepper had a field day. With a hands-off judge who allowed almost everything to come into the record, coupled with an astonishingly lethargic defense offered by Jowers, Pepper essentially had an uncontested month to argue the theory set forth in his book.

Note the incoherence between the first sentence and the rest of the paragraph. I am not a lawyer, just an English teacher, but I can recognize that "preponderance of evidence" does not have to with the *kind* of evidence that is allowed, but with the certainty of the conclusions based on the evidence. Posner's implication is that the evidence produced in this trial, because it was a civil trial, is less reliable, less "evidential," less credible, or less *factual* than it would have been if it had been produced in a criminal trial. This is absurd. It would mean that, say, 5 witnesses testifying that Joe Blow was wearing brown shoes at a certain time on a certain day is somehow less reliable, credible, factual, etc. than the same 5 witnesses testifying to the exact same thing in a criminal trial.

If Posner were honest, he would report that the Jowers verdict says that the U.S. government was *probably* part of the conspiracy to murder MLK. This is less certain, legally, than saying it is beyond reasonable doubt (which could not be determined unless the U.S. government was tried for murder). But it is still too much for Posner. He cannot allow it to stand that it was established in a court of law that the U.S. government *probably* killed MLK. He knows that the public does not react so cavalierly to the notion of a civil suit being inconsequential, since in other cases it can result in penalties of millions of dollars, even though this one awarded only $100 to the King family. (Another possible approach for Mr. Posner, Esq.: Why, this suit only involved $100. It would be much more credible if the damages were $1 million!)

The truth of the Jowers trial, even with "probably," is suppressed completely, and the further implication is that the evidence that convinced the jury of this (probable) conclusion was less reliable than if it had been a criminal trial. If he had said it this way, it would be a lie, so he says it indirectly. The fact is that the evidence is just as credible as it would have been in a criminal trial, even if the sum total of this evidence would have had to be greater to prove complicity (conspiracy).

Posner does not mention any of this evidence because it would destroy the power of his innuendo, which is that the evidence is unreliable because it was presented in a civil trial. He cannot deny the testimonial evidence that African-American police officers and firefighters had been pulled from duty in the vicinity of King's motel room, that normal security had been withdrawn in the hours before the shooting, that the sniper's bullet had come from the bushes across from the motel room and not from the rooming house where Ray was, that the bushes were removed by the Memphis police and the FBI the morning after the shooting (thus sanitizing the crime scene), that two Army officers with cameras were positioned on the roof of the fire station, also across from the motel, during the shooting, that an Army sniper team had been sent to Memphis to shoot an "unknown" target on April 4 and were being transported to Memphis when their mission was suddenly cancelled (the back-up team), etc.

Of course you can argue about this evidence. Maybe the witnesses were all lying. But this is not the point, and even Posner doesn't try to imply that lying witnesses are more likely to be found in a civil trial than a

criminal trial. He has to leave it at innuendo, because anything more specific would be an obvious lie. If the Army filmed the shooting from the fire station roof, the Army filmed the shooting from the fire station roof. This testimony would not become more credible in a criminal trial, which is what Posner wants us to believe.

As I said, it's a tricky point, and Posner is smart enough to exploit it for maximum obfuscation. But it doesn't work if you pin him down. Let him try (an imagined conversation):

"Carthel Weedon, the fire station chief, said Army photographers were on the fire station roof."
Posner: "No, they weren't."
"So Weeden lied?"
Posner: "I didn't say that."
"Then why do you think it's not true?"
Posner: "Because it was only a civil suit."
"Does that mean Weeden was more likely to lie than if it were a criminal case?"
Posner: "No."
"Does it mean he was more likely to be mistaken or confused than he would be in a criminal case?"
Posner: "No."
"Does it mean the testimony would not be allowed in a criminal case?"
Posner: "No."
"Then what does it mean?"

I will leave it to the reader to continue this imaginary conversation, which can be repeated with every piece of evidence submitted at the trial. Not in a single instance will Posner be able to tell you that any of it is less credible than it would have been in a criminal trial. He will still be able to deny that the U.S. government has been found guilty of conspiracy to murder (has it ever?), but he will not be able to deny the evidence that convinced 12 jurors that this is *probably* what happened.

Tiresome, tiresome, I know. Infinitely tiresome. That's part of it. They want to tire us out. And who are *they*? Orwell has already given us the vocabulary. Big Brother. The Inner Party. That's all we need. Why should we expect more than the King family, who "do not believe that, in such a politically-sensitive matter, the government is capable of investigating itself" but who nevertheless "have no doubt that the truth about this terrible event has finally been revealed"?

Let this be a lesson for us. The Inner Party has spoken, I have come to believe,[50] most clearly with 9/11, but also with JFK, RFK, MLK and much else. The Jowers trial was the best that could be expected in the MLK case, and I think the fact that it happened at all confirms the MITOP theory. Can we seriously doubt that the Inner Party could have prevented even this $100 civil trial if they had chosen to? Why did they allow it, then?

I think it was their way of saying to the King family, to black Americans, and all Americans, "Ok, here's your truth. Deal with it." It was a relatively gentle reminder to the slaves (99% of the population) of what happens when we get uppity and start messing with the Inner Party's wars (Vietnam then, Iraq et al. now). A more brutal reminder could have been to fly a plane into the Memphis courthouse and blame it on "The Friends of James Earl Ray" or somesuch. I daresay that black people are better equipped than white Americans to understand such messages, and the response of the Kings, acknowledging that truth had been served, even though justice must wait for a while yet, shows that they understood it. This is not submission, or even acceptance, but in fact an act of resistance. Bearing witness may be the best we can do, for the moment.

9/11, by contrast, was not gentle at all, but a great big slap in the face,. The Inner Party obviously felt we needed a strong reminder that War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery, Ignorance is Strength, Arbeit macht frei, Jedem das Seine, etc. So what can we do? Strive for something like the Jowers trial? Yes, I think so. We could do much worse – for example, by doing nothing and allowing truth as well as justice to be buried forever.

I am writing this before watching the CNN documentary "Eyewitness to Murder," which is scheduled for Sunday evening here in Germany, on purpose. CNN is not going to testify, or allow others to testify, in the way that I mean. They are not going to tell us what the Jowers trial told us. I'll be surprised if they quote the verdict, which is the only real source of inspiration. What we'll get is further obfuscation of the Unsolved Mystery and

---

[50] See "MITOP and the Double Bind," in this volume.

vapid accolades to MLK, stuff about Barack Obama moving us toward "the dream," etc., all of which is exactly in tune with War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery, Ignorance is Strength. Praise be to the man we killed. MITOP is Hope. We slapped down King to kill the dream, but Dream on, brothers!

We don't have to fall for it. That's another thing we can do.

The Linguistics of Deception

March 21, 2008

When CNN announced their documentary[51] on the assassination of Martin Luther King, which aired here in Germany on April 6, I predicted[52] that they would not mention the verdict of the 1999 Jowers trial. This was of course the civil suit that the King family brought against Loyd Jowers, the owner of the restaurant below the rooming house where James Earl Ray rented a room on April 4, 1968, and from which he supposedly shot King on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel opposite. The King family won the suit, and though the legal consequences were trivial (Jowers was ordered to pay $100 in damages for "wrongful death"), it brought a certain amount of closure to the King family, and for them and millions of other (not only black) Americans, established the truth in the case as definitively as could be realistically expected. As the King family statement says[53]:

> 1. We initially requested that a comprehensive investigation be conducted by a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, independent of the government, because we do not believe that, in such a politically-sensitive matter, the government is capable of investigating itself.
>
> 2. The type of independent investigation we sought was denied by the federal government. But in our view, it was carried out, in a Memphis courtroom, during a month-long trial by a jury of 12 American citizens who had no interest other than ascertaining the truth. (Kings v. Jowers)
>
> 3. After hearing and reviewing the extensive testimony and evidence, which had never before been tested under oath in a court of law, it took the Memphis jury only 1½ hours to find that a conspiracy to kill Dr. King did exist. Most significantly, this conspiracy involved agents of the governments of the City of Memphis, the state of Tennessee and the United States of America. The overwhelming weight of the evidence also indicated that James Earl Ray was not the triggerman and, in fact, was an unknowing patsy.
>
> 4. We stand by that verdict and have no doubt that the truth about this terrible event has finally been revealed.
>
> 5. We urge all interested Americans to read the transcript of the trial on the King Center website and consider the evidence, so they can form their own unbiased conclusions.

This statement, as well as the verdict and transcript of the trial, is easily accessible on the King Center website, and William Pepper, the lawyer who represented the King family, was interviewed at length by CNN for the program, although virtually nothing he told them was included (see Pepper's interview[54] on Air America). The full story, in addition to what is documented in the trial transcript, is detailed in William Pepper's 2003 book *An Act of State: The Execution of Martin Luther King*.

Unfortunately, my prediction was right on the money. The CNN "documentary" makes no mention whatsoever of the most important documents in the case, the Jowers trial verdict and transcript and the King family statement. The King Center is mentioned, but not the King Center website where these documents are posted. Pepper's book is not mentioned either. Instead, we are given CNN's version of "the full story," which is the exact opposite of what those documents state. We are told that the Jowers trial was a "sham," that "questions still linger and fester," and that "some of Dr. King's closest aides believe the full story has yet to be told."

One of these aides was Andrew Young, who is quoted in the CNN program as saying: "I don't think he [Ray] "had anything to do with the killing."

Does this sound like a *question*?

---

51 Transcript here: http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0804/05/siu.01.html.

52 See "Martin Luther King and 9/11," in this volume.

53 See https://www.thekingcenter.org/KingCenter/Transcript_trial_info.aspx.

54 See http://www.911blogger.com/node/14968.

Later on Young says, reflecting accurately the opinion of the court and the King family (neither of which is mentioned): "I think that there was a determination in very high places that our movement had to be stopped" and that the conspiracy "certainly went as far as the FBI. And the Memphis police. And the U.S. military."

Does this sound like a *question*?

Now, where does CNN get the idea that the Jowers trial was "a sham"? From John Campbell. John Campbell was the Shelby County criminal prosecutor in Memphis, Tenn., who prevented Ray from getting a trial during the last four years of his life (1994 to 1998). Ray tried unsuccessfully for 30 years to get a trial. He had been convicted on the basis of his so-called "confession" in 1968, more properly described as a plea bargain, which he recanted three days later. Thus the only trial that was ever allowed to take place in the King case, the Jowers civil trial, is dismissed as a "sham" by the man who prevented the criminal trial from taking place.

Why does Campbell – and CNN by implicit agreement – think the trial was a "sham"? Because "his [Jowers'] own lawyer put up little resistance, and the jury never had a chance to hear the prosecution's case."

Huh? The lawyer was a jerk, and the jury didn't hear the prosecution's case? What kind of trial was that?

This can only be a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. CNN (and of course Campbell) know perfectly well that Jowers' lawyer (Lewis Garrison) attempted no elaborate defense because Jowers did not resist the suit. On the contrary, Jowers repeatedly confessed that he played a minor role in the conspiracy to kill King, as did Ray (the patsy). As for "the prosecutor's case," CNN refers throughout the program to Campbell as "the prosecutor," although they know that he was not the prosecutor in the trial. The "prosecutors," more precisely, the plaintiffs, were the King family, and their case was not against Ray but against Jowers and "Other Unknown Co-Conspirators." This case most certainly was heard by the jury. But CNN is clearly hoping that viewers will understand "the prosecution's case" to mean the case against Ray. Thus the implication is that the trial was unfair, a "sham," because the jury didn't hear the case against Ray, which is utter and juridical nonsense. No jury ever heard the case against Ray because Campbell and other state prosecutors never allowed it. If they had, he would have been acquitted. The extensive testimony in the Jowers trial makes this clear; he was, as Jowers said, just a patsy.

What CNN calls "the full story" is what I call linguistic deception. One could also call it propaganda, or just plain lying, but there is a considerable amount of craft and subtlety involved in this kind of deception which needs to be exposed because we are confronted with it incessantly in the mainstream media without being aware of it. This is of course the point, and the craft. Words can be used honestly and dishonestly, and in the latter case they convey messages that are in fact lies, that is, deliberate falsehoods, without necessarily appearing to be.

Let us take a couple of more examples. The CNN program begins with this:

> SOLEDAD O'BRIEN, HOST: I'm Soledad O'Brien at the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee.
>
> Forty years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was shot down – murdered right here on this balcony where I'm standing. The greatest civil rights leader in our nation's history killed before his dreams could be realized. The *alleged* assassin a small time criminal on the run.
>
> *Yet* to this day, questions still linger and fester. And *even* some of Dr. King's closest aides believe the full story has yet to be told.
>
> We will try.

I have already made the most important point – that the final sentence ("We will try [to tell the full story]") is ludicrous, given the fact that there is no mention in the film to the Jowers trial verdict or the King family statement. But now look at the three words in (my) italics. "Alleged" means "asserted to be true, questionably true." This is fair enough, and consistent with "questions" that "still linger and fester" and with people believing that "the full story has yet to be told." Why, then, the word "yet"? "Yet," like "but," implies a contrast. Where is the contrast? And what does the word "even" imply? It implies that that the people closest to MLK are the people most likely to have questions. What is going on here?

What is going on is that the writers want viewers to understand that Ray did it, *even though* questions remain, and these questions remain *even* in the minds of some of King's aides, who (as implied by the word "even") should be the people most likely to believe the official story (that Ray did it). How is this sleight-of-mouth accomplished? I think this is easiest to see if we look at (hear) the text as follows (omitting the word *alleged*):

> The greatest civil rights leader in our nation's history killed before his dreams could be realized. The assassin a small time criminal on the run.
>
> *Yet* to this day, questions still linger and fester. And *even* some of Dr. King's closest aides believe the full story has yet to be told.

Now it makes sense. It is still factually wrong, but it is coherent (understandable): "Ray did it, but even some of Dr. King's closest aides (who should know better), still have questions." This is what we are supposed to understand. All we have to do to understand it is forget the word "alleged." Remember, the original is a stream of speech, not a written text. It's much easier to forget things in the stream of speech – especially when you put the key word in a non-prominent position in the sentence. The least prominent position in the sentence is before the subject ("assassin"), which is defined in some linguistic theories as the "old information" (or "topic"). The most prominent position is at the end, where the "new information" or "comment" is introduced about the subject ("[is] on the run"). The information that Ray is (was) "on the run" is not really new, or even important, but the syntax prevents "alleged" from being the focus of attention, and it can thus be more easily ignored. The words "yet" and "even" in what follows then make sense, and we have a coherent idea. The problem is, the idea is wrong. It misrepresents the facts, which we know if we know what the Jowers verdict and the King family statement say, but not if we only hear the CNN report. The King family and the other people closest to King, such as Andrew Young, do NOT have "questions" about whether or not Ray was the assassin. It is quite simply a lie to imply that they do, and it has to be a purposeful one because the facts are clear.

For another example of linguistic subterfuge, let's cut to the end of the program:

> Forty years later, it's still hard to believe that such a towering man of his time had his life ended by someone who was barely more than just a petty criminal.
>
> We're often reluctant to recognize that great tragedy can arise from small and twisted minds. But that's what we believe happened to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., leaving all of America, black and white, with an everlasting loss.

I won't make much of "everlasting," which has a poetic ring but only means "permanent." "Tragic," "horrible," or even "big" would have been more appropriate, and more consistent with "towering." After all, the loss of J. Edgar Hoover is also permanent, though I doubt that many would consider it tragic. This could have been simply a poor choice of words. No such excuse is possible for the next point, which involves the use of the word "we" in the last two sentences. In the first one, it clearly means "all of us," that is, "people," "everybody." That's fine. CNN can muse about human nature. But what about that second "we"? Does it still mean "all of us"? Clearly, we are supposed to think so.

But again, this is factually wrong. "We" do not believe that's what happened to Dr. King. The King family do not believe it, the judge and jury in the Jowers trial do not believe it, and tens of millions of other Americans do not believe it. But instead of telling us this, and then clarifying "we" the only way it could be truthfully clarified, by saying "we at CNN," the writers choose to leave us with the totally false insinuation that "everybody" believes Ray did it

I realize that what I have been doing here, analyzing the transcript of a TV program, is quite abnormal. Who would bother, except a drudge like me? It is hard work, unraveling the language of deception, deconstructing the lies, and not particularly rewarding work. It's not as if I were a literary critic discovering the hermetic meaning of some great work of art. Sisyphus himself would throw up his hands at the prospect of chipping away at the mountains of propaganda that constitute our omnipresent media landscape. As a linguist and a language teacher, I am probably more patient than most with this kind of thing, but how many of us would it take, working 24/7, to keep up with the "mainstream" flow of lies, omissions and distortions? "Mainstream" is a misnomer, since the corporate publishers do not represent anything like a "mainstream" of the population, much as they would like us to believe they do, so I prefer the term "media mafia"; they have the resources, the money, the manpower and the organizations to control what passes for information, news, and in the case of this "documentary," for history.

We are in an information war, and we have to fight. This has become clearer than ever after 9/11, but the King case is particularly instructive because the truth about it has been established in a way, namely, in a court

of law, that the truth about many other so-called "mysteries," such as the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy, and most importantly 9/11, will probably never be established. We have the opportunity to see quite clearly, as I have tried to demonstrate, how deceptively and dishonestly even a relatively respectable news organ such as CNN will behave when called upon to toe the Inner Party line.[55]

[55] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inner_Party.

Chomsky and Newman – the False Debate

June 15, 2008

In preparing for my recent interview with Kevin Barrett on June 6, since I knew he wanted to talk about Noam Chomsky, I had the dubious pleasure of reviewing my own correspondence (1989-1995) with the man who seems to have become, in addition to the world's most famous linguist and leftist dissident, the most famous "left gatekeeper." I may have had more than a little to do with that, since I published three articles[56] based on our correspondence (and his 1993 book *Rethinking Camelot*), and eventually the correspondence itself (my letters and summaries of his replies) on the internet, later included in my book *Looking for the Enemy* (2008).

I did not have to look very hard to discover that not much has changed since we ended our correspondence on not-so-friendly terms 13 years ago, except that now, given Chomsky's ostrich-like position concerning 9/11, many more people who have been Chomsky admirers in the past are more than befuddled by his behavior. For me this is déjà vu. But what Chomsky and I argued about, at considerable length, was much more specific – the question about JFK's Vietnam withdrawal plan. Chomsky has not budged an inch, as of 2003 at least, from the position he took with me.[57] In fact, much of what he wrote to me appeared as an article in *Z Magazine*[58] in Sept. 1992 and later in *Rethinking Camelot*. On July 1, 1992, he wrote that he had finished "about 100 pages in draft" of what obviously became the book, and added: "Your letters, incidentally, have helped me clarify the issues to myself, as I hope will show up in what I'm writing about this."

Thus although I can claim some credit as an unacknowledged (not even a footnote!) gadfly who helped the great man clarify his thoughts, I would have been happier if the arguments that I put to him had reached a somewhat wider readership. I sent a short piece called "Chomsky on JFK and Vietnam"[59] to *Z* as a letter to the editor, and a copy to Chomsky himself, but they didn't publish it and Chomsky did not comment. It did see the light of day in a small "assassination research" journal called *The Third Decade* (later *The Fourth Decade,* now both defunct), but to this day I feel that the debate I had privately with Chomsky was the real debate, and the debate that ensued with John Newman (*JFK and Vietnam*, 1992) et al., and is ongoing, is a false debate – a red herring designed to distract us from the most important issue.

The false debate is about what was going on in Kennedy's head before it exploded on that fateful day in Dallas. It is about what he might or might not have secretly intended to do in Vietnam, and what he might or might not have done if he had lived. There is no answer to these questions, and there never will be, no matter how many additional documents are declassified or memoirs are written.[60] It will remain a contest between those who believe he wanted to withdraw and would have withdrawn regardless of the military situation (the JFK "hagiographers," to use Chomsky's term) and those like Chomsky who refuse to believe this. There seems to be plenty of "documentation" to support either belief. The result is – and it is important to note what the result is – endless debate among the "experts" and confusion and political paralysis of the public. As long as this confusion reigns, there can be no political traction for those who believe Kennedy was killed by the warmongers who feared he was going to deprive them of their lucrative adventure in Vietnam, which would be a very plausible hypothesis if it was clear that he had indeed decided to withdraw regardless of how the military situation developed.

This is more than important; it is crucial. If it were clear that Kennedy would not have fought the war, which leads almost ineluctably to the conclusion that this was why he was killed, there would be hell to pay. This is no doubt what many people thought would be the result of Oliver Stone's Hollywood blockbuster movie *JFK*, but we saw what happened. What could have sparked a revolution died, I think mainly because John Newman's

---

56 "Chomsky on JFK and Vietnam," *The Third Decade* 1993, 9.6, 8-10, https://sites.google.com/site/michaeldavidmorrissey/essays/1993-00-00 ; "Rethinking Chomsky," *The Fourth Decade* 1994, 1.4, 22-23; https://sites.google.com/site/michaeldavidmorrissey/essays/04, "My Beef with Chomsky" 2000, in *Looking for the Enemy*, https://sites.google.com/site/lookingfortheenemy/08-addenda/5-my-beef-with--chomsky.

57 See the exchange with J.K. Galbraith in *Boston Review*, Dec. 2003/Jan. 2004, reprinted here: http://www.chomsky.info/letters/200312– .htm.

58 "Vain Hopes, False Dreams," *Z Magazine*, September, 1992, http://www.chomsky.info/articles/199209--.htm.

59 See https://sites.google.com/site/michaeldavidmorrissey/essays/1993-00-00.

60 Cf. J.K. Galbraith, "Exit Strategy," http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/vietnam/exit.htm), and "Kennedy, Vietnam and Iraq," http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2003/11/22/vietnam/.

account (Newman was a consultant on the film) of the historical record was immediately attacked as "deeply flawed" and effectively refuted, primarily by Chomsky, the leading U.S. leftist dissident. One can ask legitimately, I feel, if this was all intentional, planned by Big Brother from the beginning, given not only the outcome but the actors. What interest, for example, would Time Warner, Big Brother's biggest mouthpiece, have had in producing a "revolutionary" film? And surely I am not the first person to have thought it just a little odd that Maj. John Newman, after 20 years in Army intelligence and having been the executive assistant to the director of the National Security Agency, should walk straight out of Ft. Meade as a fully formed "assassination researcher" – one who has never, it must be noted, suggested any *institutional* culpability on the part of the agencies whose documentary records he has so thoroughly investigated.[61]

There is another reason to see Big Brother's hand in this scenario, and that is the timing of these events. First of all, the Stone film appeared only three months after another film, a British documentary called *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, finally appeared in the U.S. on A&E cable after being a huge success in England and 50 other countries. I think it's a better film. It doesn't mention the war, but it presents the evidence for government complicity in the assassination in a much more effective way than *JFK* does. Why did it take three years for this film to appear in the U.S., only to be smothered by the appearance of a Hollywood blockbuster that presented, as it turned out, a fatally flawed thesis, at least in the eyes of many, including people like Arthur Schlesinger[62] as well as Chomsky? When I interviewed Nigel Turner, the producer of *The Men Who Killed Kennedy,* in April 1989, he told me that he had been told that he was "shaking the leaves on the trees." Could it be that Big Brother was more worried about the Turner film, and used the Stone film to overshadow it?[63]

1991 seems to have been a pivotal year. The cornerstone of Newman's "withdrawal without victory" thesis (as Chomsky puts it) was laid by Peter Dale Scott in 1972, in an essay published in vol. 5 of the Gravel edition of the *Pentagon Papers*, which was edited by none other than Noam Chomsky. Scott's thesis was that the language of two National Security Action Memoranda (NSAMs), one signed by Kennedy (263, on Oct. 11, 1963) and one signed by Johnson (273, on Nov. 26, 1963), revealed that Johnson had in fact abandoned JFK's withdrawal plan and adopted a strategy of escalation. These NSAMs were not declassified until the late 1970s, but Scott was able to cleverly reconstruct them – accurately, as it turned out – on the basis of other documents. Chomsky says he was never convinced by Scott's thesis, but published the article anyway.

Hardly a word was spoken or written about Scott's thesis, even after the documents were declassified, for the next twenty years. Then, in Jan. 1991, a third document appeared, right out of the blue, apparently. This was McGeorge Bundy's draft of NSAM 273, dated Nov. 21, 1963, the day before Kennedy was killed and therefore, one can assume, meant for him to sign, although he never read or signed it. I would like to know why that draft appeared when it did, and on whose initiative. In any case, before the year was out, Oliver Stone's *JFK* was released (in Dec. 1991), and Newman's book appeared shortly thereafter. Newman sees significant differences between the draft, meant for JFK, and the final version, meant for LBJ. Chomsky sees no significant differences in any of the documents, but adds that even if there were differences it would only show that JFK reversed his own (withdrawal) policy in the same way that LBJ supposedly reversed it in the final version of 273. There is of course still another interpretation, which is that Bundy might actually have written the draft

---

[61] I voiced these suspicions openly and, I feel, quite courteously in my "Open Letter" that I sent to Newman after the first COPA (Coalition on Political Assassinations) in Oct. 1994 (*Looking for the Enemy*, Ch. 7.2, online here: https://sites.google.com/site/lookingfortheenemy/08-addenda/2-an-open-letter-to-john-newman). He did not reply. Curiously, however, Michael Parenti replied, defending Newman against my "ad hominem" attack, even though he had not read Newman's book (*JFK and Vietnam*), which was the primary focus of my letter. See also my *Correspondence with Vincent Salandria*, 2007, for Salandria's detailed analysis of Newman's second book, *Oswald and the CIA*.

[62] Schlesinger, unlike Chomsky, agrees that JFK had decided to withdraw from Vietnam, but sees the attempt of the Stone film to connect this with the assassination as "reckless, paranoid, really despicable fantasy" ("*JFK:* Truth and Fiction," *Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 10, 1992, reprinted in *JFK: The Book of the Film*, Oliver Stone and Zachary Sklar, 1992, p. 394).

[63] I sent my review of the film (see *Looking for the Enemy*, Addendum 7), along with my first letter to Chomsky, that same month, and I also sent it to Oliver Stone, who replied on July 14, 1989:

> Thank you for your letter. I will look for the film you mention, but I am fully occupied now with three films and cannot pursue at this point

By September Stone had contacted Fletcher Prouty, who features prominently in the film and in my review, and with whom I had also begun corresponding, and two years later the film appeared featuring Donald Sutherland as "Mr. X," who was of course the fictional counterpart of Fletcher Prouty. I have often wondered if I was instrumental in getting Stone and Prouty together.

273 for Johnson, not Kennedy, if he was in on the assassination plot. This is hardly inconceivable, since Bundy as National Security Adviser was the highest common denominator in the intelligence loop during the presidential transition – higher than the vice-president.

If this is confusing, it's no wonder. There is plenty to argue and speculate about. Through all of it, however, there is one fact that leaps to the attention of the unencumbered observer, particularly if he has managed to avoid the morass of debate over the hidden meanings supposedly buried in the bureaucratic language of thousands of pages of government documents, and in particular of the three NSAMs in question: the only statement that refers specifically to withdrawal is *exactly the same in all three documents*:

> The objectives of the United States with respect to the withdrawal of U.S. military personnel remain as stated in the White House statement of October 2, 1963.

What, then, the naïve observer will rightly ask, is all the fuss about? What difference does it make if the change was made in NSAM 273, in the draft, or in a later document? We know that the change was made, and we know that it was made within days of the assassination. No one questions this, not even Chomsky, if we put it in the right language. But this is the problem. Chomsky will not allow us to put it in any language but his own. I tried, literally for years, to get him to agree on a formulation of the facts that we could both live with, but I failed.

Chomsky does not deny that there were "radically changed assessments of the military/political situation immediately after his [JFK's] assassination."[64] On p. 91 of *Rethinking Camelot* he writes:

> The first report prepared for LBJ (November 23) opened with this "Summary Assessment": "The outlook is hopeful. There is better assurance than under Diem that the war can be won. We are pulling out 1,000 American troops by the end of 1963." "The next day, however, CIA Director John McCone informed the President that the CIA now regarded the situation as "somewhat more serious" than had been thought, with "a continuing increase in Viet Cong activity since the first of November" (the coup). Subsequent reports only deepened the gloom.

What is the difference between saying the *policy* changed radically immediately after the assassination, or *tactics* changed radically, or the *military/political assessment* changed radically? The problem, as I wrote 15 years ago, is that

> Once you admit that there was a radical policy change in the months following the assassination, whether that change was a reaction to a (presumed) change in conditions or not, you must ask if the change was related to the assassination, unless you are a fool. Then, like it or not, you are into conspiracy theory.[65]

This is the real debate, the one I was trying in vain to engage Chomsky in. Forget *policy*. There was a change. A radical change. A *reversal* of *something*, whether you want to call it *policy*, *tactics*, or *assessment*. What was the connection, if any, between that change, that *immediate and radical change*, and the assassination?

This is the question which, I submit, Chomsky and everyone else have been avoiding for the past 15 years.

But it's obvious, you say. Of course something changed. We ended up fighting, not withdrawing. Oh yeah? I am a linguist and a language teacher. I pay attention to words. I am not oblivious to distinctions that can be made with words. But Noam Chomsky is the greatest linguist in the world. He is not easy to argue with, especially when it comes to language. For example, he wrote to me on Jan. 7, 1993:

> Let's distinguish two different theses: (1) the M-thesis (yours), and (2) the C-thesis (mine). The M-thesis holds that there were plans to withdraw from Vietnam, "predicated on the assumption of military success" (your words). The C-thesis holds that JFK planned to withdraw without victory, that is, whether the assumption of military success were to hold or not.

---

64 See, for example, his letter to *Boston Review* (note 13).

65 See https://sites.google.com/site/michaeldavidmorrissey/essays/1993-00-00.

> The M-thesis is uncontroversially true, and completely – totally – without interest. Furthermore, it has been known to be true, and uninteresting, for almost 30 years. The basic content of the withdrawal plans was made public at once, in October 1963. Since the release of the *Pentagon Papers*, it has been known that from mid-1962, JFK's war manager Robert McNamara and the U.S. command in Vietnam laid plans to withdraw...
>
> Accordingly, we know that the M-thesis is true, uncontroversially and uninterestingly. As to the C-thesis, the evidence refutes it across the board and without exception, from whatever angle we approach it. The evidence reveals that JFK was strongly committed to victory, and was willing (reluctantly) to go along with the withdrawal plans drawn up by the top military command and advocated by McNamara-Taylor on the explicit presumption of victory.

But I had already written to him six months earlier (July 18, 1992):

> The standard accounts do not say what PP Gravel says quite clearly. They say the opposite. They say (like Cockburn) there was *no change of policy*, meaning the policy of *escalation*. What should be "obvious," however, and what the PP say, is that there was no change in the policy *of withdrawal* until after Kennedy's death. There's a big difference. Almost no one says that Johnson continued Kennedy's withdrawal policy, and then reversed it. They say Johnson continued Kennedy's policy of escalation.
>
> Here are a few examples I've collected, quite at random (emphasis added):
>
> > ...President Kennedy...began the process of backing up American military aid with "advisers." At the time of his murder there were 23,000 [sic] of them in South Vietnam. *President Johnson took the same view* of the importance of Vietnam...(J.M. Roberts, *The Pelican History of the World*, 1980, p. 988-989).
> >
> > Although *Johnson followed Kennedy's lead* in sending more and more troops to Vietnam (it peaked at 542,000, in 1969), it was never enough to meet General Westmoreland's demands... (Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, 1987, p. 405).
> >
> > By October 1963, some 16,000 American troops were in Vietnam... Under President Johnson, the "advisors" *kept increasing*...
> >
> > Lyndon Johnson, who had campaigned in 1964 as a "peace candidate," *inherited and expanded the Vietnam policy of his predecessor* (Allan Nevins and Henry Steele Commager, *A Pocket History of the United States*, 1981, p. 565-566)"
>
> Thanks to accounts like those of Schlesinger and Karnow, the general public has not even been aware that there was a withdrawal policy, much less that Johnson reversed it – despite the clear account in PP Gravel. If the Stone film has informed people of this much, it has performed a public service.

This is crucial. It is not a matter of the "M-thesis" being true or false. It is true, as Chomsky says, and therefore not a "thesis" but a fact. The important question is how well known the fact is. A fact that is little known, however "uncontroversially true," has no political consequences. The "M-thesis" was not well known before 1992, and still today the general public is not aware of it. This makes it not only "interesting," but crucially important.

Now, how is it possible for what I was saying to Chomsky, and am still saying to anyone who will listen, to be "uncontroversially true" but little known, and therefore crucially important?

It is possible because of the false debate that Newman and Chomsky, almost as if they were a tandem circus act, started in the wake of the Stone film, and which endures to this day. The "M-thesis" was immediately transformed into the "C-thesis," which is not a misnomer because it really is Chomsky's thesis just as much as it is Newman's, because it is what Chomsky needs to make his argument. It is the straw man he needs to pummel.

Let me offer another example of what it is like for one of the least famous linguists in the world (me) to argue about language with the most famous linguist in the world. Chomsky and I could not agree on the difference between an *assumption* and a *condition*. NSAMs 263 and 273 (including the draft) refer to the White House statement of Oct. 2, 1963.[66] This statement says, in paragraph 3:

---

[66] See http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/state63.htm.

> Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. They reported that by the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Viet-Nam can be withdrawn..

The reference here, in turn, is to the report[67] of the same date that gives six conclusions and six recommendations. The first conclusion is:

> 1. The military campaign has made great progress and continues to progress.
>
> The second and third recommendations are that:
>
> 2. A program be established to train Vietnamese so that essential functions now performed by U.S. military personnel can be carried out by Vietnamese by the end of 1965. It should be possible to withdraw the bulk of U.S. personnel by that time.
>
> 3. In accordance with the program to train progressively Vietnamese to take over military functions, the Defense Department should announce in the very near future presently prepared plans to withdraw 1000 U.S. military personnel by the end of 1963. This action should be explained in low key as an initial step in a long-term program to replace U.S. personnel with trained Vietnamese without impairment of the war effort.

Anyone who has read anything that Chomsky has written on the subject knows that he interprets the phrase *without impairment of the war effort* as an *explicit condition*. He repeats this over and over again, as he did in his letters to me. We went round and round on it. For example, I wrote on Aug. 3, 1992:

> The PP also support your point that the withdrawal plan was conditional on military success, but I think it is more accurate to say that it was based on the *assumption* of success. I don't read the condition in the McNamara-Taylor recommendations as explicitly as you do.
>
> There is a difference between saying "If we continue to win the war, we'll leave by 1966" vs. "The military campaign continues to make great progress. We should be able to leave by 1966." The latter is only implicitly conditional. I assume you take "without impairment of the war effort" in the third recommendation as the explicit condition, but I also see a difference between "We should be able to withdraw without impairment of the war effort" vs. "If it does not impair the war effort, we will withdraw." In the latter formulation, the withdrawal decision has not been made, and there is no indication of what the decision will be. In the former, which is what McNamara-Taylor actually say, the decision had been made, and a prediction was made that the withdrawal would probably not impair the war effort.
>
> That would be the only point I would insist on. One could argue further, though, if one wanted to stretch it, that the phrase "without impairment of the war effort" refers more to how the action "should be explained" to the public (i.e. "in low-key") than to a real condition: the public should get the impression that the war effort will not be impaired. This interpretation is not illogical, because propaganda purposes aside, how could the military (or Kennedy) really have thought that withdrawal would not impair the war effort? It would have to.
>
> What is the problem with saying that Johnson reversed the withdrawal policy because conditions changed? Your basic argument would still apply: JFK was a superhawk and would not have withdrawn without victory, and thus would have done the same thing Johnson did. But the argument, formulated in this way, is conjecture, and of course can be countered by conjecture. So what? But to insist that there *was* no withdrawal policy, or that if there was one it never changed, and that therefore Johnson did not reverse it, seems specious to me, frankly.
>
> Let me risk an analogy. Suppose Roosevelt had accepted his advisers' recommendation not to drop the bomb, and made this policy by issuing a NSAM to that effect. "The war is going well and I don't want to kill *that* many Japs," he supposedly thought. He is murdered. Truman immediately orders a major review of the no-bomb policy and shortly thereafter, citing unforeseen developments in the progress of the war, drops the bomb.
>
> Of course, the analogy is weak because we are talking about Japs as the victims instead of 58,000 of our own red-blooded, but still, would you be comfortable saying Truman's decision to drop the bomb was a matter of "tactics"? Would you say there was no policy change, that Truman did not reverse Roosevelt's decision, that

[67] See http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pentagon2/doc142.htm.

Roosevelt and Truman in fact had the same policy about dropping the bomb? Would you insist on saying this, as opposed to saying "Truman reversed Roosevelt's no-bomb policy because conditions changed"?

Add to this fictive scenario that Roosevelt's murder occurred under very suspicious circumstances, much of the evidence (and lack of it) pointing to the military-industrial-intelligence establishment, who badly wanted the bomb dropped for various (the usual) reasons. Would it be unreasonable to suspect a connection between the smaller crime of the murder of the president and the larger one of the dropping of the bomb?

On April 5, 1993, I wrote:

I cannot believe you fail to see a significant difference between

a) Mary is doing well in school. She should graduate on schedule.
b) If Mary continues to do well in school, she will graduate on schedule.

a) is analogous with McNamara-Taylor, containing a prediction and an assumption, or, if you like, an implicit condition. In a), graduation is assumed to be probable. In b), which contains an explicit condition, graduation is neither probable or improbable. You refer to McNamara-Taylor as if it were analogous to b), implying that withdrawal was assumed to be neither probable nor improbable. This is simply not true, and misleading. The implication of NSAM 263 and the McNamara-Taylor recommendations was that withdrawal by the end of 1965 was probable.

The phrase "without impairment of the war effort," which you attach great significance to, means, from the point of view of the people who made the statement (McNamara and Taylor, and confirming them, JFK), "without impairment of the effort by the South Vietnamese government, with U.S. assistance, to suppress the Viet Cong insurgency." This was the official definition of "victory."

None of my arguments or analogies had any effect whatsoever. As far as I know, I am the only person to take him up on the point, but who am I to argue with the greatest linguist in the world about the difference between an assumption and a condition, or about the meaning of a word like *policy*?

It was apparently my "Open Letter" to John Newman,[68] a copy of which I also sent to Chomsky, that made him lose all patience with me. He wrote back, on Feb. 9, 1995, including "a few excerpts from the book [*Rethinking Camelot*] that you misquote with your usual consistency, which also extends to your treatment of the historical and documentary record. I frankly see no point wasting any more time on this, and won't." I replied:

Feb. 21, 1995
Dear Noam,

Thanks for answering. It is more than Newman himself or Peter Scott have done – and we presumably *agree* on the political significance of the JFK assassination!

I did not "misquote" you in my letter to Newman. I referred to pp. 91-93, where you state clearly that the assessments of the military situation in Vietnam were radically revised *after* JFK's murder, beginning with McCone's report to Johnson on November 24.

You now quote to me from pp. 81-83, where you say there were negative reports in early November. I don't think anyone denies this. The question is when the *consensus* changed from optimistic to pessimistic. Your remarks on pp. 91-93 are the clearest statement I know of that the consensus changed *after* Nov. 22, and they are confirmed by Lodge's optimistic appraisal at the Honolulu conference on Nov. 20, which I quoted in the Newman letter.

Why are you hedging now? Do you want to say now that what you say on pp. 91-93 is misleading, or that only stupid readers like me would understand it the way I have? Do you want to say now that the consensus changed before Nov. 22, or that there never was a consensus either way?

The fact is that you say clearly in the book what I tried in vain to get you to say in our correspondence: that the assessment of the military situation changed radically – after Nov. 22, but only coincidentally – which caused the withdrawal policy to be reversed (or in your words, "which canceled the assumptions on which the withdrawal plans had been conditioned" [p. 91]). The facts are thus:

---

[68] See *Looking for the Enemy*, Addendum 2, http://sites.google.com/site/lookingfortheenemy/08-addenda/2-an-open-letter-to-john-newman.

1. JFK was murdered (quite coincidentally, from your point of view) on Nov. 22.

2. "The first report prepared for LBJ (November 23) opened with this 'Summary Assessment': 'The outlook is hopeful. There is better assurance than under Diem that the war can be won. We are pulling out 1,000 American troops by the end of 1963'" (p. 91).

3. "The next day, however, CIA Director John McCone informed the President that the CIA *now* regarded the situation as 'somewhat more serious' than had been thought, with 'a continuing increase in Viet Cong activity since the first of November' (the coup). Subsequent reports only deepened the gloom" (p. 91, my emphasis).

4. McCone's reassessment was *retrospective*: "McCone agreed [in *December*] that 'indices on progress of the war turned unfavorable for the GVN' about July 1963, moving 'very sharply against the GVN' after the coup" (p. 92).

5. In the light of the "radically revised assessments of the military situation, which cancelled the assumptions on which the withdrawal plans had been conditioned" (p. 91) – all (coincidentally) after Nov. 22 – the U.S. position moved, as you put it in the title of this chapter, "from terror [JFK's policy of counterinsurgency] to aggression" (LBJ's policy of direct involvement).

Note that I have avoided saying that LBJ "reversed the withdrawal policy," since you made it clear in our previous correspondence that you will not accept this formulation. For you, LBJ was if anything less hawkish than JFK, and their policy of winning the war, and withdrawing only on condition of victory, was the same. As you know, I disagree with you on this, but this does not mean we have to disagree on points 1-5 above.

Can we agree, finally, on these five points? Or do you think I have "misquoted" you again?

I cannot understand why you think our discussion is a "waste of time," particularly since in one of your previous letters you said my questions had helped you clarify your own thinking on these matters (albeit with conclusions opposite to mine). I am hoping that you will be kind enough to return the favor, at least as far as my understanding of your position is concerned. Your book, especially pp. 91-93, made it clear to me that we agree on the one crucial (to me, anyway) point that I was trying to establish during our correspondence (or 5 points, as above). Now you say that I have misunderstood and misrepresented what you say in the book. Is it too much to ask you to say, as clearly as possible, whether you agree with points 1-5 above, which are stated almost entirely in your own words?

Sincerely,
Michael

Chomsky did not reply substantively, either to this or to my letter to Newman. What he did say was only partly comprehensible, even as sarcasm. He thanked me for the "real insight" that "the period from late October 1963 to 8 am Nov. 22, particularly the immediate post-coup period in early November, all actually *followed* the assassination." He added – sarcastically, of course – that since "Bundy, McNamara, Ball, Mansfield, the CIA, and all the rest were planning to kill JFK all along because of his secret intentions to withdraw without victory" it only makes sense to suspect that the pre-assassination period really *did* precede the assassination, but the plotters were leaking false reports of pessimistic appraisal then so as to cover their tracks from assiduous researchers seeking to bring out the real truth." He concluded:

After having read your utterly convincing theory of Newman being an agent, programmed to write a book that could easily be dismissed in standard black propaganda style so as to conceal the real truth, maybe that's true of others too. There is someone who comes to mind. How about fessing up, finally, before someone else notices it too. Or maybe that would be too dangerous: the CIA has its ways of dealing with traitors, as we know.

Maybe I'm just obtuse, but I still don't understand what made him so angry. It seemed to be more because of what I had said to Newman than what I said to him. I would like to know. It's not too late. Both Chomsky and Newman have weighed in on 9/11,[69] and we are again deeply embroiled in a war that followed immediately upon a national catastrophe. This time there is no doubt about the causal relationship. Or is there? We are

---

[69] Chomsky's views, controversial as they are, are well known; cf., for example, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BzGd0t8v-d4 (Part 1) and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LoDqDvbgeXM&feature=related (Part 2). For Newman's contribution, see the McKinney Report of July 22, 2005, here: http://www.vt911.org/McKinneyReport20050722transcript.pdf.

fighting in Iraq (and Afghanistan) because of 9/11. Bin Laden flew his planes into the WTC and the Pentagon, so we attacked Baghdad, right? Or how was that again? Something about WMDs. No, that's more Iran. Or was it NSAMs? If so, which one, which draft, which paragraph, which word, and how can we ever know for sure anyway? Something changed, though, didn't it? One day we had no war, and then we had a lot of war. In between there was *something*. Maybe Prof. Schlesinger was right to call it "reckless, paranoid, really despicable fantasy" to suspect a connection between the murder of a president and a war that followed. Prof. Chomsky seems to agree. What does Prof. Newman think? (He does not say in his books.) But now the situation is reversed. Now Big Brother tells us that there *is* a connection, oh yes, very definitely a connection, between the mass murders on 9/11 and the war(s) that followed. Now the only "reckless, paranoid, and really despicable fantasy" is the suggestion that the connection is not the one Big Brother says it is. What do Prof. Chomsky and Prof. Newman say about that? I'll be listening, but I won't be writing them any more letters.

Deep State Doublethink

August 8, 2008

Somewhere between George Bush and Noam Chomsky, who believe the 9/11 Commission Report, and David Ray Griffin, who believes "the Bush-Cheney administration orchestrated 9/11" (*Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11*, 2006, p. vii-viii,), there is Peter Dale Scott.

Scott doesn't say who did it, but as Ola Tunander[70]puts it,

> Peter Dale Scott exposes a shadow world of oil, terrorism, drug trade and arms deals, of covert financing and parallel security structures – from the Cold War to today. He shows how such parallel forces of the United States have been able to dominate the agenda of the George W. Bush Administration, and that statements and actions made by Vice President Cheney and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld before, during and after September 11, 2001, present evidence for an American "deep state" and for the so-called "Continuity of Government" in parallel to the regular "public state" ruled by law. Scott"s brilliant work not only reveals the overwhelming importance of these parallel forces but also presents elements of a strategy for restraining their influence to win back the "public state," the American democracy.

This is not very different from the more widely held "rogue network" theory described, for example, by Webster Tarpley, as "an outlaw network of high officials infesting the military and security apparatus of the United States and Great Britain" (*9/11 Synthetic Terror*, 2007, p. vi) Tarpley sees this network as "ultimately dominated by Wall Street and City of London financiers," but many other candidates have been proposed (Bilderbergers, Bohemian Grove, Skull and Bones, Illuminati, CFR, CIA, Mossad, Federal Reserve, etc.).

What these two points of view have in common, if indeed they are different at all, is the idea that there is, or still is, a "public state" (or "non-rogue" network) at all. This sounds comforting, to the extent that it encourages us to think that if we can just expose and get rid of the bad guys, we can "win the country back." The latter expression brings us all the way back into mainstream politics, where anyone dissatisfied with the status quo can complain about the country having gone to the dogs and being desperately in need of change.

It is along this continuum that we lose Chomsky and other advocates of a "structuralist" or "institutional" approach, which they oppose to "conspiracy theory" generally. The system cannot be fixed, they say, by superficial reforms, or by getting rid of the bad guys, because it is based on capitalist imperialism and the profit motive. Even if the "deep state" were exposed and removed, things would not improve significantly because the public state is the real killer. Chomsky's entire (political) oeuvre is dedicated to showing how the U.S. government (and its allies) wreak havoc in the world, not by conspiracy but openly and consistently as the logical and predictable consequence of the economic system it serves.

I think both points of view are flawed. Why Chomsky et al. refuse to acknowledge the evidence for high-level government complicity in "deep state" events like the JFK assassination and 9/11 is simply not comprehensible. They fit easily (and politically very effectively) into a "structural" analysis: both events precipitated imperialist wars – the latter undeniably, the former arguably.

On the other hand, is this notion of a coexisting deep and public state not precisely the state of doublethink Orwell described in 1984 – "holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them" (Orwell, 1984)? How is it possible, logically, to propose two things at the same time that are mutually exclusive? If the deep state exists, there can be no public state, by definition. The same is true of the rogue network. There can be no rogue network within the government *controlling* the government, because if that is the case the rogue network *is* the government.

This is not "semantics." Scott is not talking about the public face, the propaganda mask, that "bad" governments use to disguise their evil nature. There would be nothing new about that. He is talking about two governments ("states"), a good one and a bad one, that are so intertwined they can hardly be told apart, like Jekyll and Hyde. This is what Scott's oeuvre is all about – showing us how closely intertwined they are. My problem with this is that precisely because they are so intertwined, I see no point in trying to distinguish them.

---

[70] See http://www.ucpress.edu/books/pages/9959.php.

Worse, Scott's theory in the end exonerates the very institutions (CIA, FBI, Military Intelligence, etc.) he impugns. Like his friend John Newman, who can present a mountain of evidence proving that Oswald was a CIA agent without implicating the CIA as an institution, Scott does not locate the deep state in the CIA or any other government agency, or in the government at all, since what he calls the "overworld" extends far beyond the U.S. government into organized crime, international banking and finance, transnational corporations, foreign intelligence agencies, etc. Thus "9/11 was an inside job," for Scott, does not mean the (U.S.) government did it. Ditto for JFK, and all other "deep events."

As long as this doublethink holds, one is paralyzed. One cannot blame the government, or agencies of the government, because they didn't do it. Despite the overwhelming evidence tying them to all sorts of misdeeds, they are innocent as institutions because they are, after all, part of the "public state." This is where Newman leaves us, and it is where Scott leaves us. Maybe there is something about being a former intelligence officer (Newman) or a (Canadian) diplomat (Scott) that prevents them from taking the final, logical step, which I see as inevitable. If everything, or even half, of what they say is true, the government did do it, and only the government can solve the so-called "mysteries" and rectify the situation, whereupon it follows that we must try to remake the government into a true "res publica." Rather than exonerate the CIA as an institution, for example, it should be completely reformed (or abolished) as an institution. Since this can probably not be done without reforming the overarching institution, the government, of which it is a part, we can now rejoin Chomsky et al. in calling for fundamental change. I wonder if Maj. Newman and Prof. Scott would be with us on that one.

N.B. Here are a few quotes from Scott's book that I think illustrate my point:

> But the consequences of global inequality cannot be shielded from Americans forever, as this country learned with a shock on September 11, 2001 (p. 252).
>
> In the wake of 9/11, Americans were encouraged not to think of al Qaeda with compassion, or even to consider the reasons why jihadists had attacked the United States (p. 261).
>
> ...the immoral folly of Vietnam (p. 253).
>
> ...we can talk of a visionary realism: the need to bring a fresh, visionary alternative from outside to bear on institutions that, although worthy of preservation and respect, are clearly not working as intended (p. 254).

The first two quotes make it clear that Scott is much nearer to Chomsky (and George Bush) on 9/11 than to David Griffin. Scott does not think 9/11 was an inside job. All he says is that the government hasn't told the whole truth. "Jihadists" did it.

The war in Vietnam was “immoral," of course, but not from the point of view of the warmongers, and "folly" implies that it was a "well-intentioned mistake," which is the official propaganda line on that history. Chomsky would disagree, and so do I. The war in Vietnam served the economic and political interests (destroying the threat of a bad example, i.e. an independent Vietnam) of the ruling class (aka power elite, military-industrial complex, Wall Street, etc.). See Chomsky for this argument; he makes it better than I can. Where Chomsky and I differ (and I just don't know about Scott) is that I think JFK was killed in order to get him out of the warmongers' way.

Given that Scott, like George Bush and Noam Chomsky, believes that "jihadists" were responsible for 9/11 and (unlike Chomsky but like Bush) that Vietnam was an "immoral folly," it is not surprising that he considers “institutions” such as the the CIA “worthy of preservation and respect.” Even if he does NOT think these institutions were behind the JFK assassination and 9/11 (et al.), this is an extraordinarily naïve statement just on the basis of what he himself has documented.

Scott must know perfectly well that if our "institutions," in sum, our government, were still in anything remotely like a state of health, or anything remotely resembling the democratic "public state" it is said to be, the crimes of 9/11, JFK, etc. would have been solved long ago. If these institutions were still "legitimate" in this sense, sure, there could be "rogue elements" that might even manage to kill a president or fly an airplane into a building. But they could NOT have done what they did on 9/11 (brought the Air Force to its knees),

and more importantly, even if they could have done it they could not have gotten away with it. A legitimate government would have solved the crime long ago.

Scott is trying to hang on to the illusion that the government is still (if it ever was) the "public state" he imagines (and which we have all been more or less brainwashed into believing it is, if we grew up in the U.S. As I said, I think this is debilitating. We need to know where we stand. I think the perpetrators want (some of) us to know, too, but maybe we could turn that against them if we get beyond the doublethink stage where we are now.

I would like to know why Scott thinks "jihadists" were behind 9/11, and why the CIA and other secret government agencies are "worthy of preservation and respect." If they were, we wouldn't need a 9/11 truth movement because those institutions would have done their job. And I would also like to know why he doesn't believe the BBC prematurely announced the collapse of WTC 7, as he has told me in private communication.

What Happens When Superpower Defenses Really Fail

Sept. 3, 2008

Eleven years ago yesterday the trial against Matthias Rust began in Moscow. A few months earlier, on May 28, 1987, the 19-year-old German had landed his single-engine Cessna about 100 meters from Red Square. There are still unanswered questions about how this amateur pilot was able to penetrate what Bill Keller of the *New York Times* called "the world's most vaunted air defenses."[71]

There is no question, though, about the aftermath:

> With surprising speed and openness, Defense Minister Sergei L. Sokolov, 75, was retired. The commander of the air defense system, Marshal Aleksandr I. Koldunov, was sacked with a harsh rebuke from the ruling Politburo. Other senior military figures were expected to be removed more quietly.

Tom LeCompte wrote in *Air & Space Magazine*, July 1, 2005[72]:

> According to William E. Odom, former director of the National Security Agency and author of *The Collapse of the Soviet Military*, Rust's flight damaged the reputation of the vast Soviet military and enabled Gorbachev to remove the staunchest opponents to his reforms. Within days of Rust's landing, the Soviet defense minister and the Soviet air defense chief were sacked. In a matter of weeks, hundreds of other officers were fired or replaced – from the country's most revered war heroes to scores of lesser officers. It was the biggest turnover in the Soviet military command since Stalin's bloody purges of the 1930s.
>
> More important than the replacement of specific individuals, analyst John Pike says, was the change Rust's flight precipitated in the public's perception of the military. The myth of Soviet military superiority had been punctured, and with it the almost religious reverence the public had held for its armed forces.
>
> For decades, Soviet citizens had been led to believe "the West was poised to destroy them…that if they let their guard down for an instant that they would be obliterated," says Pike. It was this thinking that helped perpetuate the cold war. Rust's flight proved otherwise: The Soviet Union could suffer a breach without being destroyed by external forces. Ultimately, of course, it would be internal forces that would do the job.

We need only compare this to what happened in the U.S. after 9/11 to see the obvious. Even if 19 aeronautically challenged Arabs with box cutters directed by a cave-dweller (though a rich one) in Afghanistan were actually able to penetrate what is certainly at least the second "world's most vaunted air defenses," not once but three times in two cities, striking the heart of the financial district and the military command and killing three thousand people, not to mention myriad other technological feats such as turning skyscrapers into dust, even without hitting them, as in the case of WTC 7, and disintegrating upon impact with virtually no trace, never before witnessed in the history of the world – even if this actually did happen the way we are told, heads would have rolled, to put it mildly. But no heads rolled after 9/11. No one was fired, no one was rebuked. Instead we got the Patriot Acts, Homeland Security, torture, preemptive perpetual war on terror, etc.

---

[71] June 7, 1987, see http://www.nytimes.com/1987/06/07/weekinreview/gorbachev-seizes-the-chance-to-restructure-the-military.html?sec=&spon=&pagewanted=1://livepage.apple.com/.

[72] See http://www.airspacemag.com/history-of-flight/rust.html.

McKinney Stronger in Unexpected Places

Nov. 7, 2008

Cynthia McKinney's .1% of the vote came from some places that, for me at least, were unexpected. I would not have expected proportionately more Louisianans to vote for her than people in any other state, for example, and though California doesn't surprise me I would not have thought Maine, Arkansas and West Virginia would come out ahead of New York and Massachusetts.

This may be worth some cogitation. I voted for her mainly, but not only, because she was the only 9/11 truth candidate, i.e., the only person on the ballot (mine anyway, in Florida) who has had the guts to call for a real investigation of the major event that has been the excuse for the last 8 years of horror perpetrated by the Bush-Cheney gang. Was this also her attraction for the voters in Louisiana, Arkansas, and West Virginia? We can be pretty sure it was not the "black vote," in this case, since Obama took that. What else was it, then, if not 9/11?

These states are generally considered "conservative," are they not? Well, maybe we've got them all wrong. Just think about it. Percentage-wise, more than twice as many people in Louisiana voted for a woman who questions the official story of 9/11 than in New York or Massachusetts, those supposed hotbeds of dissent and intellectual acuity. There are (proportionately) more people in Arkansas and West Virginia who dare to think outside the box, on a par with California, than in almost every other state.

Now, I know I shouldn't speculate. It's not the "scholarly" thing to do. Someone who knows more about statistics or about the Greens' campaign or about these states may come along and rap my knuckles, but I'm going to do it anyway. I'm already an irredeemable bad boy, having back-talked two major icons that are on (I hope) my side of the barricades (Noam Chomsky and Peter Scott – see "Chomsky and Newman – The False Debate" and "Deep State Doublethink," in this volume), but in this case my speculation is supported by some other statistics from a Zogby poll in 2006.[73] This poll proved, in my opinion, that Chomsky may be dead wrong on the JFK assassination and 9/11, but he is dead right on many other things, in this case about the falsity of the assumption that education and media awareness ("keeping up with the news") make people more susceptible to the truth. It does not. In certain (crucial) cases, of which JFK and 9/11 are only two of many examples, these characteristics (accidents of birth and upbringing, usually) make the "educated" more susceptible to lies.

Which leads me to wonder if it is not precisely the relative lack of these qualities in the "backwoods" of Louisiana, Arkansas and West Virginia that makes them more susceptible to the truth, or more hungry for it (two inseparable propositions, I feel). I don't mean to offend anyone. I happen to be an incurable romantic who believes that "intelligence" is a quality that has yet to be defined but most certainly does not equate with what we call "education," "sophistication," "media awareness," "success," or IQ. I know there are plenty of these types of people in Louisiana and Arkansas and West Virginia, too, but that's not the point. The point is that maybe there are people out there whose minds are less burdened and confused (brainwashed) by what passes for "intelligent" commentary in the media, so that they are able to think for themselves. That would be what I would call intelligence, and it is not measured by IQ tests.

I get in trouble on this subject, especially with fellow teachers, whose existence is based on judging what they all too easily call their students' "intelligence." Since these judgments are inevitably (though politically incorrectly) accompanied by generalizations about sex and ethnicity, my retort to this is that if there has to be any measure of intelligence at all, then let's take the War Test. Given everything in your brain (part of which is in your chest), and all the information you can get, which box do you check when it comes to war? Yes or no? What more important question could there be to test intelligence? Everything that is you tells you either to go to war and send other people to war, or not to. That to me is the supreme test of intelligence, and you will notice that I am using no quotation marks around the word this time.

So where does this leave the so-called smart ones in the colleges and think tanks and corporate boardrooms and the Pentagon and the CIA and wherever else they hold sway, as opposed to, say, the dirt farmer with a hoe or the woman who cleans your house or the woman who picks up your garbage? And – this is my retort to the racists and chauvinists – where does that leave the white male, as opposed to the black male (and female), and

[73] See the first essay in this volume.

to women in general? You don't have to speculate on this one. There are polls. I remember one taken at the time of Gulf War 1, when the predominantly white male Congress voted with a slight majority (nevertheless an improvement over a similar vote in 1964 for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution) to abandon the Constitution and let King George decide whether to wage war or not. A large majority of women, and an even larger majority of blacks, according to this poll, were against going to war. This is, I think, consistently the case.

Does this make black people more intelligent than whites, and women more intelligent than men? Oh no, I can't say that, even as a white male, but damn it, isn't it true? Isn't it just as true, at least, as any other test result that presumes to judge intelligence, and categorize people along ethnic and sexual lines (and there are plenty that have done that). Ok, I say, you want race and gender, I'll give you race and gender, and I'll also give you an intelligence test that is much more scientific and accurate and revealing than anything you have. The results are in.

Ok, I'm being bad again, but I'm not sorry. Here is my tabulation (from C-Span[74]) of McKinney votes, and I won't call it a "state intelligence test," but I do think the numbers are worth some thought:

State	%
Louisiana	5
Maine	4
Arkansas	3
California	3
West Virginia	3
Hawaii	2
Illinois	2
Maryland	2
Massachusetts	2
Michigan	2
Minnesota	2
New Mexico	2
New York	2
Oregon	2
Rhode Island	2
South Carolina	2
D.C.	2
Arizona	1
Colorado	1
Delaware	1
Iowa	1
Mississippi	1
Nebraska	1
Nevada	1
New Jersey	1
Ohio	1

[74] See http://hosted.ap.org/dynamic/files/specials/election_night_2008/election_map_premium/index.html?SITE=CSPANELN&SECTION=POLITICS.

Tennessee	1
Utah	1
Virginia	1
Washington	1
Wisconsin	1
Alabama	0
Florida	0
Alaska	-
Connecticut	-
Georgia	-
Idaho	-
Indiana	-
Kansas	-
Kentucky	-
Missouri	-
Montana	-
New Hampshire	-
North Carolina	-
North Dakota	-
Oklahoma	-
Pennsylvania	-
South Dakota	-
Texas	-
Vermont	-
Wyoming	-

Dumbo in the Living Room

Nov. 16, 2008

I voted for Cynthia McKinney because she was the only candidate who sees him (I think it is a he). The others either don't, or won't admit it, and I see no significant difference between these two points of non-view.

According to polls about a third of the U.S. population (not to mention the rest of the world) think, or at least suspect, that 9/11 was an inside job, and McKinney was the only candidate who has even mentioned the possibility. Of course I'm glad that Obama has spared us the catastrophe of McCain, but this time I decided to indulge my "conscience" – that is, vote for the person I would really like to see in office – because it was pretty clear to me that Dumbo had decided on Obama, and in the long run we will never break the yoke of the two-qua-one party system unless we vote outside the box.

One could even argue that a McCain victory might have hastened the "revolution," but that would not have been a reason for me to vote for him. Being over 30, I prefer the slower, less violent road, and it seems to me that Dumbo, too, has decided not to lock us up just yet, which might well have been the consequence of another stolen election and ensuing popular rebellion, civil war, and martial law. What would follow that I don't know, and – here's the point – I don't think Dumbo knows either. This, more than anything else, I feel, explains Obama's victory.

Dumbo is obviously a rogue, and no one denies his technical expertise, but I don't think he's really very bright, not at least in the way that Orwell depicted Big Brother or Huxley Mustafa Mond – who are, after all, fictional. Dumbo is real, and human. In religious terms we are used to equating omnipotence with omniscience, and I will leave it to theologians (like David Griffin?) to play with the idea on that level. Here we are talking earthlings, and I submit that power and intelligence in humans correlate only negatively, if at all.

Dumbo's agenda may well be to use the "Obama hype"[75] for another war, e.g., on Iran, with or without another 9/11. Then we will be even worse off than with McCain or Palin, since it will be much easier for Obama to lie to us than it has been for Bush. Considering what Bush has gotten away with, just imagine what Obama could do. If this turns out to be the case, I hope I don't need to explain how dumb it is.

If we are a shade more optimistic we can believe that Dumbo really doesn't know what he's doing. In that case, while we may have gained some breathing space with Obama, Dumbo has, too. If he has just a little more smarts than he has displayed in the last 8 years, he may realize, if only temporarily, that he hasn't thought it through. The Cheney lobe has been telling him to go ahead and turn the whole world (starting with the U.S.A) into Guantanamo, and he has taken a big step in that direction, but what then? Does he really know what he will do with the New World Order, once he gets it? Let us hope that this inkling of self-doubt, this spark of intelligence, has penetrated. It will not save us from him, because as Orwell said, the goal of Power is Power, so it will not be long before the Cheney lobe dominates again. But time is of the essence.

If Dumbo has shifted into a lower gear, as we can hope, there is a certain amount of risk involved for him. Judging from his track record since 9/11 he must feel pretty confident, but Hope is always a dangerous commodity. With someone like Obama, it could get out of hand. People might begin to demand more than Dumbo is willing to give us. It might even affect the charismatic leader himself, if he has not sufficiently internalized the lesson of JFK, which is that Dumbo's wars are not to be challenged by mere presidents. I don't think there is much chance of that, frankly, but it's a straw to clutch.

Rather than hope for salvation in the form of a leader on a white (or black) horse, I think we should concentrate even harder on spreading the truth about 9/11. Nothing else reveals Dumbo as clearly as this, and nothing else is easier to do, thanks to the 9/11 truth movement. At some point, intelligence will triumph over power. This may be a matter of "faith," but if you don't have it, you're part of the problem. That's the long and short of that issue.

Which brings me to what seems to be becoming a recurrent theme with me: homo academicus. Maybe that's because I've spent most of my life in universities but have participated less than wholeheartedly in what Pierre Bourdieu calls the "reproduction du corps." One of my grad school professors put it more bluntly when he accused me of being unwilling to do what is necessary to become a scholar, or something to that effect. Another one told me I was the most stubborn student he'd ever had. I don't remember what the specific problems were

---

[75] See John Pilger: http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article21205.htm.

in either case, but in retrospect I can see that in the end they were correct, and that even though they didn't mean to compliment me, I now consider those judgments to be in my favor.

When I was in my twenties and the draft board was breathing down my neck, since I was in college and still reverent of academia, I listened to people like McGeorge Bundy when they told us that U.S. national security was at stake in Vietnam. Even JFK, I remember reading somewhere, said that McGeorge Bundy was one of the most intelligent people he'd ever met. Who was I to dispute this? The Dulleses, the Bundys, the Rostows, the Kissingers (thank God only one of the last) came from MIT and Harvard, the most venerable institutions in the country. I was thus left with the conclusion that by opposing the war I was either an idiot who could not understand what these geniuses were telling me, or I was a coward and a traitor, deserving only jail or exile. The CO review board decided I had no moral ground to stand on because I admitted that I would resort to violence if necessary to save my life or that of my wife or child, which according to McGeorge et al. was precisely the case in Vietnam.

Is it any wonder that I was confused? But since I was also stubborn, one big question stuck in my brain for many years: How could smart people be so fucking stupid?

Fast forward a quarter of a century, when I happened to see a TV documentary[76] about the JFK assassination. I woke up, like Rip Van Winkle, and found that I also had the answer to the question that I had never managed to completely forget: They weren't stupid, they were lying.

A few years later, in 1993, I started corresponding with Noam Chomsky.[77] This was a painful experience which left me, to this day, ambivalent in my feelings about the man,[78] and actually brought me back to the same question I'd had many years earlier, only now applied to someone I truly respected and thought I agreed with, except on a single issue (JFK). I could not believe that he was lying. I still can't.

Then came 9/11, and now we have 100 million Americans who question Dumbo's version of 9/11, to say the least, but Chomsky is not one of them. Since my background is in linguistics, I look around to other linguists, the most famous of whom, like Chomsky, are considered as and consider themselves experts on the human mind ("cognition"), and "progressives" or at least "liberals," if not as "radical" as Chomsky. I am thinking, for example, of George Lakoff and Steven Pinker. Where are their opinions on 9/11? Why is it that they seem to have no opinion on this subject, or if they do, that it is so naive (if that is the word)? Pinker begins his latest book, *The Stuff of Thought*, parroting the official version of 9/11 and apparently accepting it as truth:

> On September 11, 2001, at 8:46 a.m., a hijacked airliner crashed into the north tower of the World Trade Center in New York. At 9:03 a.m. a second plane crashed into the south tower. The resulting infernos caused the buildings to collapse, the south tower after burning for an hour and two minutes, the north tower twenty-three minutes after that. The attacks were masterminded by Osama bin Laden, leader of the Al Qaeda terrorist organization, who hoped to intimidate the United States into ending its military presence in Saudi Arabia and its support for Israel and to unite Muslims in preparation for a restoration of the caliphate.

This from a person of his intelligence, of his renown, of his expertise on the subjects of language and the human mind?

Is it any wonder that I am again confused? How can they be so stupid?

Is there any other way to put it? Any other way to couch it in psycho-babble or in some sort of theoretical construct that would make it any different from this, from exactly what it looks like and sounds like, and is? What else can you call it but stupidity – unless they are lying? Uninformed? That just doesn't work with these guys. They have informed themselves. It has been 7 years, for crissakes. David Griffin alone, to take a fellow academic, has written 7 books and many articles about it; they need only have read one.

I have objected to Stupidity Theory[79] as a catch-all explanation for virtually everything, especially catastrophes like wars, 9/11, and more recently the financial crisis, this being Dumbo's favorite "analysis," but

---

[76] See *Looking for the Enemy*, Addendum 7: http://sites.google.com/site/lookingfortheenemy/08-addenda/7-review-of-the-men-who-killed-kennedy.

[77] See "Chomsky and Newman – The False Debate," in this volume.

[78] See my poem "Noam," in this volume.

[79] See "Stupidity Theory," in this volume.

in this case I see no viable alternative. I have proposed my own psychological analysis,[80] but regardless of all that, if stupid is what it looks and acts like, is it not exactly that?

I rest my case. I know how it makes me look. Who am I to question the intelligence of people like Steven Pinker, George Lakoff and Noam Chomsky? I have a neighbor with Down's syndrome whom I sometimes help across the street at the bus stop, a life-threatening affair because the cars whiz by oblivious to the speed limit or the safety of pedestrians, much less those with Down's syndrome. He once referred to these drivers, quite vehemently, as "idiots," and I realized that for him this was anything but an idle remark considering how often he must have heard that epithet applied to himself.

He was absolutely right, of course.

[80] See "MITOP and the Double Bind," in this volume.

9/11 Aletheia

May 8, 2009

I stumbled across this word (being, like Shakespeare, of small Latin and less Greek) looking for a name for my new Google group after I decided that the idea of a 9/11 truth "coalition" (the name of my Yahoo group, now defunct) was dead, gone, and non-resuscitable. "911truth" was already occupied, and "911veritas" is somebody's web moniker, so I found this. As it turns out, I like it. It's fuzzy and furry, doesn't make a lot of noise, and you can play with it.

Hence was born 911aletheia.[81]. The word (rhymes with *panacea*) has a long history, as one might expect of a Greek word (except for medical neologisms), but what I like most about it is that it is not related to words like *truth*, going back to words meaning "faith, trust" and "firmness" (hence the further connection with *tree*), or to *veritas* (English *verity*, *verdict*, French *vérité*) or the set of words connected with German *Wahrheit* (cf. English *aware*, *beware*), which are also rooted in concepts of faith or trustworthiness. *Aletheia* means "not forgetting," from *a-* "not" + the word for "forgetting" that comes from *Lethe* (rhymes with *leafy*), the river of forgetfulness. *The American Heritage Dictionary*, which is pretty good on etymology, has the river name (one of five rivers in Hades) from the word for forgetfulness, not vice versa, but it doesn't matter.

If we were ancient Greeks, and dead, we would take a swig from the Lethe to ease our passage into the next life. Today, we don't have the Lethe but we have the Teevee. Works great, and we don't even have to die to use it. All the bad stuff goes right down the tube as soon as the current crisis is over. Rarely does it last as long as Vietnam did, though Iraq/Afghanistan is running a close second. The mass larceny known as the "financial crisis" will be over the minute the stock markets bottom out and the bankers have robbed us of us of everything but our ditch-digging backs and toilet-scrubbing fingers, the AIDS depopulation scheme is long since forgotten by everyone except the president's ex-preacher,[82] and the 9/11 "truth movement" is hopelessly fragmented. Back in 2006, I failed even to get a significant number of leading "truthers" to unite behind impeachment, much less make common cause with antiwar groups. The chances of anything like that happening now seem even more remote, with a semi-popular president, despite polls[83] that show a widening disjunct between what people believe and what passes as for "truth" in the mass media and official publications (e.g., the *Warren Report*, *9/11 Commission Report*). Impeachment is still a good idea, but for that very reason it is unlikely. The propagandists have been much too hard at work.

It is not a matter of "protective stupidity," as Michael Green[84] calls it. We are not too stupid to understand a world run by "privatized covert action mercenaries" created by the CIA and the Council on Foreign Relations. In his more recent essay[85] Green offers a hodgepodge of tired phrases ("invisible government," "ruling class"), obviously new to Green or he wouldn't spend 4 out of 14 pages repeating them in an article about thermitic dust, which I would not object to in principle any more than I do to Peter Scott's masterly elaboration of the same ideas in *The Road to 9/11* (see "Deep State Doublethink," in this volume), but Green's amateurish analysis offers nothing but ominous-sounding innuendo:

> [The WTC demolition was] "*coordinated* through the security apparatus of the World Trade Center *in conjunction with high-ranking members* of the U.S. military...whose *cooperation* was required...
>
> ...the intelligence agencies that *coordinated* this grand act of political theater.
>
> The U.S.G., in *cooperation* with *elements* of private industry and finance capital, brought us 911.
>
> Not all of the actors who served the cover-up were aware of their roles, but they were ultimately set into motion by those who were.
>
> ...the *fundamental source* of political power...known well only to those who participate regularly in it, and to a small number of personas...
>
> ...the "*invisible government*"...persons who control domestic covert action to effect profound changes...and who also own and control much of Congress.

---

81 A Google group, now defunct.

82 See http://www.rhrealitycheck.org/blog/2008/03/21/rev-jeremiah-wright-and-pepfar-aids-complicity.

83 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/9/11_opinion_polls.

84 See http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/loose_change.html.

85 http://www.opednews.com/articles/Pardon-Our-Dust-or-Why-t-by-Michael-Green-090417-989.html.

> The *ruling class* of the United States responded to threats to the U.S. dollar and U.S. global hegemony by generating a pretext for war in the Middle East...

All this, Green continues, is too much for "very good" researchers like David Ray Griffin and Niels Harrit to understand because they have "failed to learn the palpable lesson" that calling for a new congressional investigation is pointless.

This reminds me quite unpleasantly of the reaction I got from all sides (e.g., planers and no-planers, left and right) in 2006 when I tried to launch my 9/11 truth coalition to impeach Bush-Cheney, which drove me to verse.[86] Things were quite a bit hairier then, I dare say. We have breathing space now, with Obama, but there's no telling how long it will last. Now is the time to put the pressure on, and no one as enlightened as Green says he is could fail to see this.

Perhaps if Green and his friends Jim Hoffman and Victoria Ashley spent less time trashing their fellow truthers[87] hope could be re-engendered for making common cause with myriad groups that have organized against the 9/11 lie and the wars and anti-constitutional laws it has brought us. Discrediting by association is the oldest trick in the book, and these three have used it systematically, first against Fetzer, Reynolds, and Wood by throwing them, with no justification whatever, into the same pot with anti-Semites like Eric Hufschmid, and then against a whole slew of people for allowing themselves to be "associated" with Fetzer, Reynolds, and Wood by belonging to the same organizations (Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Patriots Question 9/11). Even if membership in these organizations actually meant anything, such tactics are deplorable and hard to see as anything but purposely divisive – which of course is what they accuse their designated enemies of being for daring to discuss or even support arguments about no planes, video fakery, and non-conventional weaponry.

Since when did the suppression and demonization of ideas qualify as science? I am not a no-planer, but why shouldn't I be able to discuss it on the Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice forum (of which Ashley is the moderator), and why shouldn't Congress be asked to investigate the claims of video fakery and directed energy weapons along with thermitic dust? The argument that "asking Congress to investigate many poorly defined, and highly implausible hypotheses minimizes the chances that Congress would be willing or able to investigate the actual evidence," as Ashley writes on behalf of Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice,[88] begs the question, obviously, of what is plausible. The purpose of the investigation would be to find that out. If the investigation turned out to be as dishonest as the first one, and could not distinguish more plausible theses (such as thermitic dust) from implausible ones (e.g., 19 Arabs defeating the U.S. Air Force), there would be no point in having it at all. Nothing would be lost, and much gained. If nothing else, the "wayward" (or open-minded) truthers could be shown the error of their ways and brought back into the fold.

Discrediting by association, which Ashley risibly fails to see applies to her own piece more than it does to the organization she is trying to discredit, Patriots Question 9/11, is bad enough when used against people, but when it is also used against ideas, it is even more despicable (if that is possible). Of course there are limits to free speech. But video fakery and non-conventional weapons are not Holocaust denial. Nor are they arguments for the innate superiority of a certain race, the benefits of National Socialism or Communism, cannibalism, incest, or child rape. They are not morally reprehensible. If they are silly, let them be shown, or show themselves, to be silly.

It is shameful that this has to be said, but there is a more insidious consequence of this suppression of ideas (i.e., of the discussion of them, which amounts to the same thing). From the beginning, a faction of 9/11 truthers have vehemently opposed arguments for no plane, a different plane, or a missile at the Pentagon, on the grounds (read "speculation") that at some future date the government could whip out one of the dozens of videos they have documenting the event and show us all up as idiots. Green says "the entire discussion of what hit the Pentagon is a tar baby designed to trap the 911 truth community in useless speculation."[89]

---

[86] See "On the Way to the Gas Chamber," in this volume.

[87] See http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/loose_change.html, http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/company.html, http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/st911/index.html, and http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/patriots_question/index.html.

[88] See http://stj911.org/press_releases/Misrepresentation.html.

[89] See http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/company.html.

This has always been a specious argument, and now that the likelihood of any videos appearing, much less any that would support the official story, is virtually nil, it is worse than worthless. Nothing would show more clearly the participation of the U.S. military in 9/11 than evidence of a missile, or indeed of anything other than Flight 77, having hit the Pentagon. Compare this with the relatively limited consequences of proving controlled demolition. I can hear a hundred voices now asking, "How did those dang terrorists git hold of that thermite, and how did they git it into the buildings?" – a question that would keep everyone busy forever. If it ever reaches the point where they need one, the government will choose this limited hangout, because it poses the least threat.

Controlled demolition is the real tar baby, and Br'er Green should know it. Why does he spend 4 pages in his discussion of the Harrit et al. paper[90] lecturing us on the "invisible government" while ignoring the one passage that actually does point to a possible connection with the government? On page 26 the authors quote a report on an April 2001 conference disclosing that

> ...all of the military services and some DOE and academic laboratories have active R&D programs aimed at exploiting the unique properties of nanomaterials that have potential to be used in energetic formulations for advanced explosives…. nanoenergetics hold promise as useful ingredients for the thermobaric (TBX) and TBX-like weapons...

Why does someone so concerned about the invisible government ignore the one clear connection with the real and visible one? Why take the leap from nanothermite to the "ruling class" and ignore the one concrete point of support provided – especially when his lame conclusion is that nothing can be done except wait for others to be blessed by the same sort of "epiphany" that struck him (when he saw NASA's thermal survey showing hot spots in the ground after 9/11). Even that wouldn't help much, though, since most people (unlike himself) are "ill-equipped" to use such a revelation.

"Former Assistant Professor" Green (self-described) would do well to consider that evidence of video fakery, missiles, remotely controlled airplanes, different airplanes, or non-conventional weapons is far more likely to cause an epiphany than thermitic materials in dust. Obviously, examining the dust is important. But there is no justification for suppressing other lines of investigation. All the evidence should be considered.

Maybe we need a new definition of "truth." I return to my newfound Greek word *aletheia*. It means "not forgetting." Not forgetting is not the same as truth, and not the same as a movement. But it is not forgetting, either. As I said in an earlier essay,[91] the closest we may be able to get to truth may be something analogous to King v. Jowers (1999). We can be thankful that we have William Pepper, whose book *Act of State* documents this truth about the King assassination and the struggle to get it, working with the NYC Coalition for Accountability Now.[92] He has warned us against infiltration, but I don't think he would warn us against the discussion of certain ideas or to ignore relevant evidence. The process, even more than the outcome, is the important thing. Even if we never get our day in court, we can testify. We can bear witness.

This is what the resisters to coalition initiatives fail to understand, or pretend to. It is pretty clear to most of us that Congress is not going to reinvestigate 9/11, and that if they do it will just be another whitewash, just as it was clear to most of us that Bush-Cheney would not be impeached. What matters is the political process. The process of impeachment, the process of any sort of investigation of 9/11, whether it ends in stringing up Bush and Cheney or not, would be progress – or at least would provide an opportunity for progress. It would help inform the public and make more information available. The strategy least likely to have this effect, in fact most likely to have the opposite effect, is to limit discussion to "evidence that is simple, clear, and convincing, not abstract, obscure, dubious or debatable," as Green[93] would have us do.

What is simple about nanothermite and red/gray bi-layered chips shown by electron microscopy and x-ray energy dispersive spectroscopy to be highly energetic unreacted thermitic material? What is simple about the conclusion Green (though not Harrit et al.) so glibly jumps to – the connection to the U.S.G. and the "ruling

---

90 See http://www.bentham-open.org/pages/content.php?TOCPJ/2009/00000002/00000001/7TOCPJ.SGM.

91 See "Martin Luther King and 9/11," in this volume.

92 See http://www.nyccan.org/.

93 See http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/loose_change.html.

class"? And what is simple about the same person warning us about tar babies at the Pentagon, and then throwing this obvious tar baby in our faces? Green[94] says his "perspective" is "entailed by the thermitic dust," but this "entailment" means that "even those best equipped to understand it [including himself, presumably] also know the vagaries of research and look for further evidence to confirm or disconfirm it." So good luck to those brave and (most importantly) persistent researchers who will someday prove that the thermitic dust proves that the U.S.G. and the ruling elite did 9/11. It seems to me that Green is planting a herring redder than his face should be for calling Dylan Avery's work "naive, foolish, uninformed and ignorant," Jim Fetzer's work "essentially unintelligible," and Morgan Reynolds "a downright crank." If Avery is "a calculating mole or at best a naïf who has been used by such" because his first film wasn't flawless, what does that make Michael Green, who came out of nowhere (no previous publications) to become an instantly prominent (featured on Hoffman's influential website) Avery, Reynolds and Fetzer basher?

We live in an age of propaganda. Information Warfare aka Operations is only the military equivalent of a long-established principle that pervades society: the public mind, especially in democratic societies where physical coercion is discouraged, must be controlled. We don't need Orwell's or Huxley's futuristic visions to see this, or the platitudes of Michael Green. The Committee on Public Information was formed by the U.S. government in 1917 to get public opinion behind the planned entry into World War I, and ten years later one of its members, Edward Bernays, wrote the bible on propaganda. As that word acquired negative associations with the bad guys – first Nazis and then Communists – the same concept was re-dubbed "public relations." Bernays begins his first chapter, "Organizing Chaos," with a clear statement of the principle:

> The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country.
>
> We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of. This is a logical result of the way in which our democratic society is organized. Vast numbers of human beings must cooperate in this manner if they are to live together as a smoothly functioning society.
>
> Our invisible governors are, in many cases, unaware of the identity of their fellow members in the inner cabinet.
>
> They govern us by their qualities of natural leadership, their ability to supply needed ideas and by their key position in the social structure. Whatever attitude one chooses to take toward this condition, it remains a fact that in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons – a trifling fraction of our hundred and twenty million – who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind, who harness old social forces and contrive new ways to bind and guide the world. (*Propaganda*, 1928.)

Here we have it. Big Brother has been watching, and doing, for a long time. It is literally business as usual, and as American as apple pie. I don't know if Orwell read Bernays, but "inner cabinet" is easily substitutable for "Inner Party," Green's unoriginal "ruling class," C. Wright Mills' "power elite," the Soviet "nomenklatura," etc.

The internet is also a mass media, and we "truthers" really would be as nuts as the likes of Bill O'Reilly says we are not to assume that the information warriors, that is, "public relations" specialists, are out in force every day and night doing their job of "organizing chaos." This sounds oxymoronic because it is. More clinically, it is schizophrenic – the same state of mind, of helplessness and paralysis, that I described in "MITOP and the Double Bind" (in this volume). We really do understand, at some level, we are meant to understand (Made It Transparent On Purpose), and we are also meant to understand that the situation is normal, desirable, and that there is nothing we can do about it. We are here to consume and cooperate "as a smoothly functioning society."

Truth may not be possible in such a society, in which case we are chasing a chimera. But there are different kinds of truth,[95] and the kind that is publishable in *Time* or *Newsweek* or on Teevee, or that can be established by a congressional inquiry, is not necessarily what we are after or will be satisfied with. I like my new word, *aletheia*. It's a little awkward, syntactically, but maybe it will open some new horizons and take us beyond

---

[94] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Pardon-Our-Dust-or-Why-t-by-Michael-Green-090417-989.html.

[95] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truth.

measuring the worth of ideas in terms of what their imagined effect will be on others, or in terms of what other ideas they might be "associated" with. The word itself is a case in point, since it is often associated with Martin Heidegger, who is often associated with Nazism. Fortunately, being as unversed in philosophy as I am in Greek, I didn't realize this until I had already discovered the word and decided to adopt it. Now I have a sense of possession and refuse to give it up, no matter what Heidegger had to say about it or what others have had to say about Heidegger. I may read Heidegger someday, but for the moment I am glad to have a new word.

For one thing, I like the negative aspect of it. If 9/11 truthers agree on little else, they agree that the official account is false – not only not true but a pack of lies, omissions and distortions. In addition, as I have said before, the best evidence for U.S. government complicity in 9/11, which automatically means guilt given the incomparable power of that government, is that it happened at all. None of it would have been possible without government sponsorship, and even if part of it did happen by some fluke (e.g., one plane crash), an innocent government would have solved the case long ago, and not with a ridiculous fairy tale about suicidal whiskey-swigging lapdance-loving Muslims who couldn't fly a Cessna doing impossible acrobatics with commercial airliners, but with a credible story and convincing evidence. If a plane crashed in Shanksville or into the Pentagon, there would be proof, in the form of evidence nobody would question. Ditto for the WTC. We would not be going round and round about questions like "Were cell phone calls possible from airplanes flying over 5000 feet in 2001?" (the answer to that one now being clearly "No," but still unacknowledged by officialdom), "Can Boeing 767s hit buildings flying at 540 mph at 1000 feet, and can they even fly at that speed and altitude without breaking apart? (unanswered), "Can a backhoe pick up a piece of molten steel?" and "Can a video that shows a 767 penetrating a steel and concrete building like a hot knife into butter be real?" It is simply impossible to imagine that the federal government, with all its resources, could not have answered all these questions, and many more, a long time ago if they had wanted to. And what possible motive could there be for not answering them, and prevaricating, if the government itself is not guilty?

An unanswered question is not what we normally think of as truth. It is not "proof positive." We can't send anybody to jail on the basis of an unanswered question. But in this case the unanswered questions, particularly since there are so many of them, do constitute aletheia, whose literal meaning, according to the anonymous Wikipedia author, is "the state of not being hidden; the state of being evident."[96] It is evident, simply from the unanswered questions, that 9/11 was an inside job. It is equally evident that the government is not going to indict itself. It is also evident, to me at least, that they want us to know they did it.[97] That is the only explanation for the obvious bungling of what could have been an undetectable false-flag operation, if that had been what the perpetrators wanted. One can imagine a million ways a "terrorist" attack could have been feigned and blamed on a designated enemy, with no questions asked. I don't believe in "Stupidity Theory."[98] Somebody made a conscious decision to do it this way, to "shock and awe" us into acceptance and resignation.

Green may not have read my articles (e.g., on "Transparency Theory," in this volume, available online since September 2006), but he has read Salandria,[99] and should have understood more of what he read, which seems to be about 50%. In his 1971 essay "The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: A Model of Explanation," almost every word of which, with the appropriate substitutions, can be applied to 9/11, Salandria clearly says there are two reasons for the perps to show their hand. One is to prevent everybody from seeing the light at the same time by making "selectively orchestrated revelations of their bloody work," which Green seems to have understood, crediting himself with having this "epiphany" (his word) after seeing NASA's thermal survey showing inexplicably long-lasting hot spots at Ground Zero (apparently applying his experience as a psychologist to make this discovery). If he had read further, however, he would know that the second purpose of these purposeful revelations in the JFK case was intimidation – to show those who did understand "what was in store for any quixotic citizens who saw fit to oppose the new rulers of our land."

Another point Salandria makes in the same passage that Green cites, but ignores, is apropos:

---

[96] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aletheia.

[97] See "MITOP and the Double Bind," in this volume.

[98] See "Stupidity Theory," in this volume.

[99] See Vincent J. Salandria, *False Mystery: Essays on the Assassination of JFK*, 2004.

> I have long believed that the killers actually preempted the assassination criticism by supplying the information they wanted revealed and also by supplying the critics whom they wanted to disclose the data. Does it not make sense that if they could perpetrate a coup and could control the press, they would have endeavored to dominate likewise the assassination criticism?

Though Green may not have read my articles, if he is a serious student of Salandria he has read my book (*Correspondence with Vincent Salandria*, 2007), or John Kelin's *Praise from a Future Generation*, 2007. From either book he could have learned something about the dangers, not to mention the immorality, of using guilt by association to discredit others. He might have thought twice about aligning himself with Victoria Ashley, who aligns herself with Josiah Thompson in her smear[100] of Jim Fetzer et al. Vince has quite a bit to say in our correspondence about Thompson, e.g.:

> (3/1/94) On Thompson, I believe he was an agent from the beginning. I met him when I was called to get him and other peace demonstrators out of jail. He then curled around me trying to get me to write *Six Seconds in Dallas* with him. I separated myself off when he saw the front entry throat hit as an exit [wound] caused by exiting bone. Perhaps this is a delusion of grandeur, but I feel that he was sent in to give me media exposure and thereby neutralize and/or co-opt me.
>
> (4/7/2000) ...after *Six Seconds in Dallas* was published, I invited him over to my home for a party.
>
> At the affair, I put to him how he could have written the last paragraph of *Six Seconds* which concluded with the question of what does all of this prove? He answered his question by flatly stating that it did not prove a conspiracy.
>
> "Tink, how could you write that?" I asked him.
>
> He answered: "An error in exposition, Vince. An error in exposition."
>
> After comparing notes with Ray Marcus about it, he and I concluded that Thompson was an agent....
>
> Now, so many years later, Thompson's "error in exposition" is converted into another explanation. Thompson currently describes himself as an agnostic on the issue of conspiracy in the Kennedy assassination.
>
> We also know from the government documents that he was approached for possible employment by the CIA prior to the assassination.

Salandria wrote that "a full explanation of this thesis [of transparent conspiracy] must await another occasion." I'm afraid that 9/11 has supplied that occasion, and I have tried to articulate a fuller explanation, but it doesn't really go beyond what Salandria told us in 1971.[101] What is different is the degree of disclosure, of evidence, of aletheia. Plausibility of denial has become pretense of denial. Green says "now, the facts that matter politically are in." No. Thermitic dust is not a smoking gun, and certainly not a basis for concluding that the "ruling class" did it. The stupidity of this leap is exactly contrary to the conservative strategy of the Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice, and will have the opposite effect of what (I hope) Green intended. The evidence has been in for a long time, at least since 2004 when David Griffin's *New Pearl Harbor* became available, and for many from the get-go. I was not one of the first to see it. I needed Griffin to lay it out for me, though I did have my suspicions. In hindsight, everything is clear, simply because it happened. It's like Big Brother (pun intended) hitting Little Sister in plain view of Mommy, and then exclaiming, "I didn't do it!"

You might think this is all a bit too subtle, overdrawn. Paranoid, even. In that case, draw a line under it and call it art. (See Heidegger on this if you like it real complicated.) Put it in your mental museum, or on your fiction shelf along with the *Warren Report* and the *9/11 Commission Report*. Consider it a footnote to Orwell (1984+25) I can live with that. Just don't say I didn't tell you.

---

[100] See http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/patriots_question/index.html.

[101] See "MITOP and the Double Bind," in this volume.

Was the Air Force One Flyover a Warning to Obama?

May 21, 2009

The only thing I have read about this strange event that asked the right question was on wsws.org, one of my favorite sites. Alex Lantier[102] wrote on April 29:

> How could one of two specially-designed presidential jets be requisitioned for a flight over New York City, where nearly 3,000 were killed in the 9/11 attacks, without the knowledge of the president, the mayor or high-ranking U.S. military officials such as the defense secretary and the joint chiefs of staff? If the official story is indeed true, it raises the question of who is in control of the U.S. military.

The White House internal review[103] published a week later, I think, answers the question: the U.S. military is in control of the U.S. military.

The responsible office was the White House Military Office. Everybody in that office except the fall guy (Director Caldera) is in the military or a civilian employee of the Dept. of Defense, including Deputy Director George Mulligan and Col. Scott Turner, head of the Presidential Airlift Group (PAG). The PAG is part of the 89th Airlift Wing of the 18th Air Force, which is part of the Air Mobility Command, a Major Command of the U.S. Air Force.

It is not clear exactly whose idea it was originally, but the planning and execution were carried out by PAG. It was, as Mulligan wrote to Caldera on April 24, "an AF operation, in close coordination with FAA" (Internal Review, p. 3).

The rather ludicrous details of the communication breakdown between Mulligan and Caldera, concerning emails sent but not read or read too late, and hallway discussions misinterpreted as an "aside," do not disguise or mitigate the fact that Mulligan was the military's point man on this, and that it was he who failed to inform his boss (Caldera) properly. This is not stated explicitly in the review, but all the details point clearly to this conclusion.

On the day of the event[104] Caldera said, "Last week, I approved a mission over New York. I take responsibility for that decision." He told the White House Counsel's Office conducting the review a week later, however, "that he was not asked to approve the flight. If he had been asked to make a decision," he added, "he would have received a formal package requesting his approval and he would have expected earlier and more extensive discussions with Colonel Turner and the Deputy Director" (p. 4).

So why did Caldera take the fall? "Because it was the 'stand-up thing to do,'" he is quoted as saying (p. 6). There is no acknowledgement of guilt, but only of responsibility, in his May 8 letter of resignation:[105]

> I have concluded that the controversy surrounding the Presidential Airlift Group's aerial photo shoot over New York City has made it impossible for me to effectively lead the White House Military Office. Moreover, it has become a distraction to the important work you are doing as president. After much reflection, I believe it is incumbent on me to tender my resignation and step down as director of the White House Military Office.

Compare this with Mulligan's and Turner's "stand up," which sounds more like a comedy act than an act of contrition:

> At some time during the day [April 27], the Deputy Director spoke to Colonel Turner. The Deputy Director expressed surprise about the flight, because he had been led to believe that the mission details had been coordinated. In the Deputy Director's view, the breakdown was the lack of public notification. Colonel Turner was equally surprised, because the FAA had taken the lead on public affairs and coordination.

---

[102] See http://www.wsws.org/articles/2009/apr2009/over-a29.shtml.

[103] See http://static.cbslocal.com/station/wcbs/docs/flyover.pdf.

[104] See http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Statement-from-Louis-Caldera-Director-White-House-Military-Office-on-Air-Force-One-flight-over-New-York/.

[105] This was online at the time of writing at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/05/08/AR2009050803039.html.

Why weren't Mulligan and Turner fired? They were clearly not following the orders of their superiors, Director Caldera and President Obama, nor those of Robert Gates, the Secretary of Defense. Gates, with his CIA background, cannot necessarily be taken at his word, but he is also a political appointee, and he says he didn't know about the plan, either, or approve it[106]:

> I am concerned that this highly public and visible mission did not include an appropriate public affairs plan nor adequate review and approval by senior Air Force and DoD [Department of Defense] officials.

We note that Gates also expresses his "regret" and "concern," but not responsibility or guilt.

Is it conceivable that a relatively low-echelon DoD civilian and an Air Force colonel would have the temerity or wherewithal (not to mention colossal stupidity) to do such a thing on their own? I think not.

On April 28, the day after the flyover, Obama[107] said:

> It was a mistake, as was stated. It was something we found out about along with all of you, and it will not happen again.

He was referring to Caldera's statement, which constituted the White House apology of the day before. This is the word – "mistake" – that stuck in the press and will stay in our minds. But what does this mean?

Does it mean that Obama regrets not knowing that the Air Force was flying his own airplane, and nuclear command center whenever he is in it, around Manhattan in restricted airspace scaring people[108] half to death because they thought it was another 9/11? Does it mean that his man Caldera, who was supposed to be in charge, didn't know what the Air Force was doing either?

"Whoops, sorry. I know I'm supposed to be the commander-in-chief, but in this case – just in this one case, this one tiny case, I assure you – I wasn't. The Air Force did their own thing. I found out about it along with all of you. It won't happen again."

Well, yes, WYSIWYG, that is exactly what it means, and if we allow ourselves just a second's further reflection, we realize what a terrible and devastating admission it is. It means that the president is not in control of the Air Force, is not the commander-in-chief, and therefore the Constitution is no longer the law of the land. Therewith is the promise of it not happening again, coming from the mere president, completely vacuous.

If that sounds exaggerated, it is only because in this instance the damage was limited. Suppose it had been something more consequential than just scaring the bejesus out of a few New Yorkers – like a nuclear strike on Iran? How ready would we be to accept the explanation that it was a "mistake" in that case?

Now the opposite point of view: OMIHOP (Obama Made It Happen On Purpose). According to this theory, it was a publicity stunt[109] by Obama, i.e., by people acting on his behalf. An Air Force officer[110] who carried the "nuclear football" for Bill Clinton, which is also carried on Air Force One, called it "wantonly careless." Rush Limbaugh[111] says "Obama cannot credibly say he didn't know that this was happening," thus calling the president a liar, and then lies blatantly himself, saying of Caldera: "He's the guy that planned it. He's the guy that set it up..."

But Caldera is not the guy who planned it, as Limbaugh also knows if he read the White House internal review. The idea of a "publicity stunt" is implausible on its face. Neither Limbaugh nor anyone else has tried to explain what might have been the reasoning behind such a hare-brained scheme – understandably, since there could have been no "reasoning" at all behind it.

---

106 See http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5gHRSsmkccdxnpDj1rg8g7aadv95w.

107 See http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/04/28/obama-calls-air-force-flyover-a-mistake/.

108 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tN57C98B310&feature=related.

109 See http://spectator.org/archives/2009/04/29/flyover-launcher.

110 See http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=96511.

111 See http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/daily/site_042809/content/01125107.guest.html.

On the other hand, what we do know, thanks to the White House review, is that it was a military operation from start to finish. That message is quiet but clear, not in the headlines but accessible to anyone who wants to find and read the Internal Review.

It is tempting to draw two conclusions from all of this, from both the incident itself and the White House's reaction to it.

One is that we may have here a quite realistic model of how the government actually works. This is without question how it worked in the case of this relatively harmless event, but if generalized it also fits the worst case scenario to a T – that 9/11 was an inside job – which is what tens of millions[112] of Americans now believe. The parallels are striking. The military (supposedly) screwed up royally, just as they (supposedly) screwed up on 9/11, failing to protect us from (supposedly) 19 Arabs with box cutters. As in the case of 9/11, the military have unconvincingly attempted to shift the blame to the FAA, although, as with 9/11, neither military nor FAA personnel were fired. Was April 27 a reenactment of 9/11 on a minor scale, to serve as a reminder, primarily to Obama but also to us, of who is really in charge?

The second conclusion is even more speculative, and some will say preposterously naive, but what if Obama really is another JFK, as many, including Caroline and Ted Kennedy, have dared to hope? They did not choose American University as the place to endorse Obama (on Jan. 28, 2008[113]) for no reason. In 1963[114] JFK also talked about courage, and he was referring not to politicians but to the Russian people when he said, "No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue."

Times have changed. Now that statement applies more to Americans than to Russians, and I think we can take Ted at his word when he said we can reach our goals "only if we have the courage to choose change"; the "we" is not rhetorical.

Maybe the not-so-coded message from the White House is a call for help. If Obama does have the courage to oppose the warmongers, as JFK did, he cannot do it alone. If he has just gotten his face slapped in public by somebody who is a lot bigger and meaner than he is, which appears to be the case, and if we want him to fight back, we will have to fight with him. This is at least the ghost of a hope we haven't had for a long time.

---

112 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/9/11_opinion_polls.

113 See http://students.barackobama.com/page/community/post/samgrahamfelsen/CGVRs.

114 See http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03AmericanUniversity06101963.htm.

The Truth Wars

May 27, 2009

I suspected it might happen, but I was hoping for the best from my fellow "scholars" in the 9/11 "research community." Instead, I got the worst. Hence the quotes, because I can no longer have confidence in either their "scholarship" or their sense of "community." This is important not because it tells us anything about 9/11, but because it tells us something about 9/11 truth-seekers. How can we expect to find truth, when the seekers behave so badly (to put it mildly)?

Shortly after I published my article "9/11 Aletheia" on OpEdNews.com, I was removed from the membership list of Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice, shortly after that from their forum, and on May 20 I was put on "probation" (the "moderation queue") at 911Blogger.com. I offer myself, therefore, as Exhibit A in my case against the closed-mindedness I criticized in my article.

I have been a member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice (STJ911.org) since its founding in 2006, when it split off from the original Scholars for 9/11 Truth (911scholars.org) founded by Jim Fetzer. I remained a member of both organizations, because I saw no reason not to. Both, it seemed to me, had their merits. I joined 911Blogger.com at about the same time, and since September 2006 I have made 62 postings to that site.

This history is important, because I am not a "no planer" or proponent of theories of video fakery or exotic weaponry, and I can prove it. My only, cardinal sin is this one recent article where I dared to defend the principle of free discussion.

I fully realize that there are limits to free speech. The Holocaust, for example, does not belong in discussions about 9/11. But to take this as a case in point, in May 2006, in the old Scholars forum, when it was run by Steven Jones as part of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, which he then co-chaired with Jim Fetzer, precisely this subject came up for discussion. I was surprised – shocked, in fact – when I vigorously protested and only one other member of the forum supported me. (It was *not* Steven Jones or Victoria Ashley.) I finally wrote privately to Jim Fetzer, who did not normally participate in the forum, and asked him to intervene, which he did. If Jim had not put a stop to it, I would have left the forum but the discussion would no doubt have continued.

All the more ironic (perverse is more like it) to find the moderator of the new Scholars forum (Jones faction), Victoria Ashley, announcing to the members on Oct. 20, 2008:

> STJ does not support theories of exotic weaponry or similar (DEW, nukes, TV fakery, no planes at the WTC) and will remove from its membership any who make public assertions about such theories. That is not a personal decision but a scientific, strategic and common sense one – those theories have no scientific evidence to support them and serve to undermine what our own published researchers are moving forward with by making us appear nonsensical, and cannot be supported by STJ.

This was presumably a reaction to the Draft Bill[115] presented by four (former) members of Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice to eight members of Congress on Oct. 18, 2008, asking for a new investigation in the light of evidence pointing to the possibility of controlled demolition, and also the possibility of video fakery and the use of non-conventional weaponry in connection with the events of 9/11. This initiative was repudiated by STJ911 on Oct. 22 as a "misrepresentation" of their organization, with Victoria Ashley named as the contact person.[116]

I didn't like the way this was presented on the forum, though, which after all was not public but limited to members of STJ911. So I wrote on Feb. 8, 2009:

> I hope this doesn't mean I will be thrown out because I have decided to allow discussion of these "forbidden topics" on my forum [the Google Aletheia group I had just created]. I will moderate closely and try to keep the discussion rational and civil. It certainly does NOT mean that I endorse everything people say. On the other hand, can I not form my own opinion and have the right to express it? How can progress of any kind, political or scientific, be achieved without open discussion? I understand the arguments – and as you know they go both ways – but censorship and forbidding discussion cannot be the right way to go. Fine if you don't want to allow

[115] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/8-House-Members-View-Draft-by-Barbara-Ellis-081018-925.html.

[116] See http://stj911.org/press_releases/Misrepresentation.html.

> it here, but I (and others) MUST have the right to discuss what we wish elsewhere without threats or intimidation.
>
> The way you have expressed it above, this is intimidation. You cannot dictate what I say, publicly or privately, and if you threaten me with exclusion from this group because I express an opinion you do not agree with (as long as I do not claim that I represent this group, which I have never done and will not do), you have no right whatsoever to take this position. I suggest strongly that you revise your wording.

Needless to say, Ashley did not take my advice, and now I have been thrown out of the forum, and the organization, not because I "misrepresented" them as the other four errant Scholars purportedly did, and not because I support any of the taboo theories (which I do not), and not even because I talk about them – but because I have said that people who want to talk about them should be able to talk about them without being slandered and ostracized. I suppose this qualifies as making "public assertions about such theories," although no one from STJ911 has bothered to tell me why I have been expelled.

At least 911Blogger had the courtesy to tell me why I am being made to sit in the corner. Allan Giles ("Reprehensor") wrote[117]:

> This site does not, and will not promote obvious disinformation like TV Fakery, or the WTC demolition concepts represented by "Directed Energy Weapons" as put forth by Judy Wood, or the "Mini Nuke" idea put forward by Bill Deagle.

Thus my article is interpreted as promoting "disinformation."

I rest my case. Read my article, and decide for yourself whether these reactions are justified, much less the work of "truth-seekers" or scholars interested in "truth and justice."

But I am a peaceful person. If any of the people I have had issue with wish to join my forum,[118] where all relevant discussion is allowed, I will treat them more fairly than they have treated me, and much more fairly than they have treated some of our colleagues.

---

[117] See http://www.911blogger.com/node/20159.

[118] Now defunct.

Troo Wit Troot

June 15, 2009

I am not Irish. However, I like the way they speak what is called, for no good reason I have been able to discover, "English," and hence I feel that even if what I have to say fails to make the kind of sense I have in mind at least I will have the satisfaction of having said it in a way I like. I did not do so well with Greek,[119] since I have learned that *aletheia* does not rhyme with *panacea* as I thought but is pronounced "uh LAY thee uh," with the stress on the second syllable. It does mean troot, so I got the meaning right, and it did get me kicked out of three "truth" organizations,[120] which was not my intention but it's just as well. I'm troo wit troot, or more precisely, trooters.

No sooner had I come to the defense of Jim Fetzer, the founder, owner, chair, and perhaps sole remaining member (I am exaggerating somewhat) of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, of which I was also "co-chair" for a few days, than I discovered that we have differences after all that have nothing to do with "no planes," video fakery, or directed energy weapons but are nonetheless serious. As a result, Jim thinks I have gone "haywire," and I have resigned my membership in his organization.

It is a little embarrassing, because what has caused our disagreement is exactly what I defended him for: freedom of speech. I think there are limits. This is not a contradiction. As I wrote in my article, guilt by association is despicable and I still condemn the tactics used by Hoffman, Ashley and Green to ostracize and demonize anyone (like Jim) who talks about video fakery and DEW. But as I also said, I was not talking about murder, rape, warmongering, terrorism, cannibalism, child pornography, male chauvinist pigism, anti-Semitism, or racism. There is a difference. I do draw the line at "associating" with people who have views that are morally reprehensible.

I realize this is touchy ground, and in a perfectly rational world no limits would be necessary because all the irrational ideas would die quick deaths and humankind (as well as animal and plantkind) would be spared all the trouble that they cause. Unfortunately, though, the world is not particularly rational, and I thought the forum that I started (when the Google group glitched I changed it to 911aletheia.ning.com) imposed on me a certain amount of responsibility. I decided not to allow one particular person to join, or even allow discussion of his work, because a quick Google search, after I heard that he planned to submit his article to American Free Press and The Barnes Review, revealed that he had also written the following on a website whose very name[121] gives it away:

> This site is an eye-opener for me and I was not aware that it existed. I have been blinded from the Truth for all of my life due to extreme censorship of school textbooks, publishers, video documentaries, movies, newspapers, magazines, etc…. I am extremely angry about this censorship. I see it all very clearly now, starting only a few years ago, starting when I read the book "Jewish Supremacism." I have a lot more reading to do on this site, and learning to add to my disgust about be lifelong duped [sic] and deceived.
>
> The American Free Press web site also has a lot of current and good related information for the discerning researcher.
>
> Endless thanks to the originator of this website for exposing this otherwise extraordinarily censored history and current events. Keep up the incredible work, but you need, somehow, to get it to all of the people of the U.S.A. and the World….
>
> How could I have been deceived, fooled, duped, defrauded for so, so, so long???

The author of *Jewish Supremacism* is David Duke,[122] a well-known racist and anti-Semite. I also objected to Jim linking to a version of his own article "9/11 and the Neo-Con Agenda" published by America First Books,[123]

---

[119] See "9/11 Aletheia," in this volume.

[120] See "The Truth Wars," in this volume.

[121] "RealZionistNews"; see http://www.realzionistnews.com/?p=144.

[122] See http://www.davidduke.com/general/jewish-supremacism_129.html.

[123] See http://amfirstbooks.com/IntroPages/ToolBarTopics/Articles/Other_Topics/9-11_Anomalies/Dr._James_H._Fetzer_2008-04-22_9-11_and_the_Neo-Con_Agenda.html.

whereupon Jim informed me that he had also published a joint statement with William Fox and Eric May. Fox is the founder of amfirstbooks.com, which also hosts such (un)worthies as Michael Collins Piper.

All of this I found very distressful, especially since one of the reasons I came to Jim's defense on the issue of 9/11 is that back in 2006 he was the only person in the old Scholars forum (when Steven Jones was running it), except for one other member named "Diane," who supported me when I complained about a discussion of Holocaust denial that was taking place on that forum. Now Jim accuses me of an "excess of anti-anti-Semitism."

We also clashed on a less sensitive, though not minor, point: understandability. I have spent most of my life in academia, so I am used to people pretending to know a lot more than they actually do, but since this was my own forum, I decided that I had the right to insist on understanding what was discussed there. I made a rule that everything should be understandable to ordinary speakers of English – radical, but it made sense to me. To bring the point home I posted an article in German as an example of an unacceptable post. Similarly, I would not accept posts in Chinese, Japanese, Tibetan, Hindustani, or any of several thousand other languages I do not understand. One of these languages is higher mathematics, and another one is physics. I don't speak much chemistry or mechanical engineering, either. At least, I added, if we were going to discuss things in these languages, there should be at least one person in the discussion who is able and willing to translate everything into plain English.

Another problem I have on the forum, though it does not concern Jim Fetzer, is anonymity. Real life is my model, and my mistake, I suppose. Would I be a neo-Luddite if I objected to talking to someone dressed in a white sheet who refused to tell me anything about what was under the sheet? Sure, you might argue, in the old days, when we were real, we needed stuff like that, but this is the Computer Age. Now we can say whatever we want to whenever and however we want to and never have to take any responsibility for it – unless of course the FBI or some other Authority decides our little game is up. Until then we'll just play and play, ducking and hiding from each other but knowing all the while that Big Brother has our ass in a sling from the get-go. Everything is cool.

Given my peculiarities, the membership on my forum is likely to go from 32 to one in short order. But maybe that's the way to go: a forum of one. I could have long conversations with myself, as one anti-anti-Semite to another, and talk and talk, not fretting much about who might be listening. Sort of like right now, troot to tell.

Shill Heaven

June 28, 2009

If anything is clear about the recent Iranian election it is that all sides have been afforded ample opportunity to get in their licks. First of course there is the mainstream media, who have been screaming fraud at the top of their hypocritical lungs while keeping steadfastly mum about massive and transparent election fraud in the U.S. (Selection 2000 being only the most conspicuous example). Not to be outdone, "dissident" pundits of all stripes have swooped in on the opportunity to accuse the mainstream of a shameless propaganda campaign in order to discredit the election results and manufacture an excuse for a harder stance against Iran, or even military intervention.

The smoke and mirrors here are perfectly positioned for all sides. The anti-Ahmadinejads can claim, quite rightly as has become increasingly clear, that the incumbent Iranian regime not only rigged the vote but also put down the protests with despicable brutality. The anti-anti- (not to say pro-) Ahmadinejads can claim, with much less evidence (none, in fact, that I know of) but with ineluctable logical appeal to a certain mind-set, that the protests were orchestrated by the CIA. After all, they say, quite correctly, the CIA does bad stuff all over the world, every history of the Agency tells the story of how Kermit Roosevelt replaced Mossadegh with the Shah in 1953, etc.

From the cui bono point view, both sides have a plausible argument. One can easily imagine that not only the CIA and the U.S. government but Americans in general and people all over the (western) world like the idea of a popular uprising in Iran against the evil Ahmadinejad. How much more evil can you get than being a nationalist and nuclear aspirant not in the U.S. camp, and to top it off a Holocaust denier! With just a bit more thought, it is even easier to imagine that the hardliners in this country and elsewhere are quite happy with Ahmadinejad as the designated enemy. It would be considerably more difficult to agitate against Iran with a leader that is – if only in appearance – more moderate. Stephen Zunes made this point in a recent article entitled "Why U.S. Neocons Want Ahmadinejad to Win."[124]

You can knock me down, step on my face, and slander my name all over the place, to quote Carl Perkins (and Elvis), should I defend the CIA, but has anyone stopped to ask just how the CIA could have persuaded thousands of Iranians to pour into the streets and get clubbed and shot to death for their own good? Surely they would not have done so knowing that the CIA, whose notorious history is well known in Iran, was behind it. So how was this trick accomplished? I do not underestimate the CIA's cunning, power, or ruthlessness. Their ability to buy, sell and kill people and control organizations and events is undisputed, but I cannot think of any examples offhand of their successfully fomenting popular uprisings, especially in countries where they and their tactics are well known and hated. I am not saying it cannot or did not happen; I'm just saying I would like to see some evidence. It would be important for us all to know how this is done, so that the next time we go to the barricades – if there is a next time – we can feel confident that it's not just the CIA pulling our strings again.

Not only is the Iranian situation good for all sides, it's so good that some commentators cannot resist playing on both sides. For example, Michael Green, who has unfortunately stopped adorning himself with the title "former assistant professor," thus depriving us of needed comic relief, has weighed in with a particularly foolish contribution that supports both sides in the same article, appropriately entitled (originally) "Whatever the results of the June 12, 2009 Iranian election are, the U.S. intent is to demonize and destabilize Iran." In a later revision of the article, now entitled "The CIA and U.S. Media Roles in Destabilizing Iran,"[125] having learned that "additional information has come to light supporting the charge of massive electoral fraud," he regrets not having kept the original title, even though it is clear, up until the end of this silly piece, that he sides with those who disbelieve the reports of fraud.

Green erupted on the scene in 2005 by viciously attacking two real professors, each with a CV and list of publications that puts his to shame (zero prior to 2005), because they (along with Dylan Avery, the creator of the phenomenally successful internet film *Loose Change*) dare to consider ideas about 9/11 that Green and his equally narrow-minded (putting it generously) colleagues Jim Hoffman and Victoria Ashley do not consider worthy. (See "9/11 Aletheia," in this volume.)

---

[124] See http://www.alternet.org/world/140707/why_u.s._neocons_want_ahmadinejad_to_win/.

[125] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Whoever-won-the-June-12-2-by-Michael-Green-090621-240.html.

In the same spirit, Green now attacks the aforementioned Stephen Zunes[126] for 1) not answering his email, 2) writing "from the omniscient perspective," and 3) not having written about election fraud in the U.S. – until now. The third accusation is particularly amusing coming from someone who wrote nothing at all about anything until he came out of the blue (retirement, apparently) in 2005 to attack three of the most prominent members of the 9/11 truth movement, and now Zunes, a prominent progressive leftist Green derisively calls "Mr. Z Mag." The sin of "omniscience" means that Zunes failed to "source" his opinions. Green takes most of his own opinions from much better articles by Paul Craig Roberts, Stephen Lendman (whose name he misspells), and savvy writers at wsws.org like Bill van Auken (who will cringe, I'm sure, to see Green refer to him and his colleagues as "fellow socialists,"[127] but chastises Zunes for being "oblivious" to a study sponsored by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund that he (Green) admits is "flawed and fallible and incomplete"! Nevertheless, Green considers it a credible source because it supports his view – at the beginning of the article – that Ahmadinejad's victory was legitimate.

By the end of the article, Green has reversed himself about the evidence of fraud, but instead of rewriting or (heaven forbid) taking back what he said about Zunes, he feels inspired to ask the "interesting question" as to "why the rigging was done so crudely." We are left to figure out for ourselves how it is that Zunes, who was right, is "either a very dim-witted progressive academic, or he has another agenda," whereas Green, who was wrong, can retain his exalted opinion of himself (as he wrote in an earlier article[128]) as "a mind acquainted with history and unburdened with a trust in the devotion of the U.S. ruling class to democracy and to the welfare of the American people" and "familiar with the resources of the U.S.G. Intelligence Community and the cooperation it commands within the ruling class." He adds, magnanimously, that Zunes "does not appear to be dim-witted," but unfortunately, despite his familiarity with the U.S.G. Intelligence Community, he does not specify further. It doesn't matter, because Green has fingered everyone from the Council on Foreign Relations to the CIA to "privatized covert action mercenaries," "high-ranking members of the U.S. military," "elements of private industry and finance capital," "the invisible government," and, ultimately, "the ruling class" as being responsible for 9/11 (see "9/11 Aletheia," in this volume), so we can assume that they (and Zunes) are behind this Iranian business too, although he now adds to his culprit list, just for good measure, "the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg Group that jointly seek to dominate and control this planet." (He left out the Illuminati, Freemasons, P2, Bohemian Grovers, Skull and Bonesers, the International Banking Cartel, and a few others, but maybe he'll get them in next time.)

In addition to telling us that the Iranian election both was and was not rigged, Green enlightens us on other matters. I did not know, for example, that the CIA overthrew the Shah and installed the Ayatollah Khomeini. Nor did I know that the Lyndon LaRouche organization was charged by the U.S.G. intelligence community "to advertise obscurely a covert operation that they dearly wished to keep secret, but to wrap it with the noxious LaRouchian ideology and nimbus so that anyone else respectable who revealed it could be smeared and dismissed as touting a crazy LaRouchian idea." Aha!

And what about *The Nation*? I have had my doubts about them, but until now I would not have been able to say with such certainty that it stands "shoulder-to-shoulder with the Agency" and that its mission is to take "a 'liberal' posture in order to channel political dissent back into the existing systems of establishment power and to legitimize that establishment. One of its particular tasks is to deny the existence of major U.S.G. domestic covert operations, especially since its editorial staff and some of its writers are engaged in at least the propaganda cover for such." Aha No. 2!

With so many CIA shills in place, not to mention the Trilateral Commission, Bilderbergers and all the rest, one wonders if there is anybody we should listen to – other than Michael Green, of course, who has it all figured out. Given that choice, I'll go with the shills.

---

126 See http://www.alternet.org/story/140626/.

127 See http://www.opednews.com/populum/diarypage.php?did=13258.

128 See http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/hamburger.html.

Shock and Awe't

August 24, 2009

I went to school with a guy who became big in the art world, and that's how he pronounced it: awe't. He was from New York. He called himself Reggie in those days, but now he prefers Reginald, thinking it I suppose more befitting of his age and social status. I can understand that. I had an aunt that everybody called "Baby" until she died, in her late 70s, which must have been hard. But Aunt Baby didn't die in a penthouse, in fact never lived in one, though she did once invest in a racehorse. She and her husband Helmut, who has also since died, liked nice things and only bought the best, even if they had to buy it in installments. I by contrast am still prone to buy the cheapest stuff that will do the job, so there you have it, the difference between an aesthete and a philistine. My idea of a good novel is one I can finish. I judge works of art in museums by how fast I walk by them, although I did once buy an oil painting in Portugal, probably because it was black and white and fit our furniture and I didn't have to deal with the colors.

I guess I should admit that I envy Reggie, though I honestly think it is less for his fortune than for his love of art. He seems to have it in his blood, the very person Keats was addressing when he wrote

> "Beauty is truth, truth beauty," - that is all
> Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

Of course the world, especially the art world, is full of phonies, but Reggie has always been this way, even before he became a billionaire, and Aunt Baby was probably at least a little bit this way too because I know she didn't buy the few nice expensive things she had to impress anybody. So let me not put too fine a point on it. Everybody, even me, probably has some appreciation of beauty. It's a matter of degree.

What confuses me about Keats is that phrase "need to know." He was too early to know about the CIA, and maybe just too young period (he died at 25) to know about a lot of things, but Reggie is long past 25 and still going strong. It was Reggie, not Keats, that came to mind when I read a recent article by socialist critic David Walsh[129]:

> Marcuse argued that art was particularly problematic because it has the unique capacity to provide an illusion of happiness in the present, unlike religion or philosophy. Through the beauty of a work of art, according to Marcuse, the individual's discontent with the world is momentarily suspended, and thus art, by making the beautiful appear possible within the existing oppressive conditions, "pacifies rebellious desire.... Men can feel themselves happy even without being so at all."
>
> Marcuse suggests that centuries of culture have served to accommodate human beings to the contradiction between the society's professed ideals and its brutal reality, and, in fact, play no small part in the willingness of individuals to "march with so little trouble in the communal columns of the authoritarian state," that is, participate willingly in the fascist movements or armies.
>
> These are false views, in my opinion, whose ideological roots lie in German subjective idealist philosophy. There is an actual content to art, not simply the beauty of form. Not content as a lump, or a single "message," but "a living complex of moods and ideas which seek artistic expression" (Trotsky). Art can make a deep, objective penetration of existence, its development, its history, its contradictions. What if – in and through art – individuals learn something about their "unfreedom," about their social existence, what if their discontent, in fact, is deepened?

This is all a bit too rarefied for me. I think I agree with both Walsh and Marcuse, but it doesn't really help. I still feel like I'm missing something. Something big. That's one minute. The next minute I'm wondering if Reggie is missing something. Something big.

Shock and Awe't. Ground Aught. How do you get that on an urn?

---

[129] See http://wsws.org/articles/2009/apr2009/art2-a22.shtml.

9/11, Anti-Semitism and Denial

Sept. 10, 2009

It is often pointed out that antisemitism (or anti-Semitism), meaning "anti-Jewish," is a misnomer since the word *Semitic*, strictly speaking, refers to a number of peoples, including Jews and Arabs, and a number languages, including Hebrew and Arabic. In the case of 9/11 conspiracy theories, however, the term is properly inclusive, since both Arabs, or Muslims, and "Zionists," or Jews, have been fingered as the culprits. The U.S. government conspiracy theory, of course, is that 19 Arabs did it, and anyone who has looked into the subject will know that speculation about "Zionist" authorship of the attacks (and much else) is rampant.

More than enough has been published on the first conspiracy theory (by David Ray Griffin and others) to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that it is not only wrong but an outright lie. The second one has to be handled differently because, in my opinion, it is the manifestation of a social mental illness that is historically conspicuous and still widespread. I am not being facetious, any more than I am when I describe racism and nationalism in the same way, and it is no surprise that these three illnesses, or syndromes of the same illness, are almost invariably found together. (Anticommunism used to be part of the same complex, but it has receded in recent years.)

One does not have to be a psychiatrist to analyze this disease, or its root cause, which is denial. In order to deny an uncomfortable truth, a scapegoat is found to carry the burden of guilt, a role which Jews have been forced to play often enough. In the case of 9/11, the uncomfortable truth to be avoided at all costs is that our own government (the American, U.S., government) is responsible, and if the 19 Arabs (or Saddam Hussein) won't do as scapegoats, Jews (or "Zionists") are convenient alternatives for many.

One example will suffice to support this point. On his radio show[130] on Sept. 1, 2009, Kevin Barrett asked Christopher Bollyn the following question (my transcript):

> Well, your investigation has taken you on a path that's a little bit off the beaten one of the mainstream of the 9/11 truth movement, which has pointed towards evidence implicating high-level American figures, including, well, I guess Dick Cheney is everybody's favorite suspect, but along with Cheney I suppose Bush, other members of the Administration, and presumably the CIA , but you're arguing that actually there's primarily a kind of a foreign apparatus behind this attack, presumably the Mossad and perhaps an associated prime network out of Israel, and the reason that a lot of 9/11 truth leaders like DRG don't talk about this or emphasize this, I think the first reason is that they don't think the evidence is as strong. You know we have evidence that the U.S. govt covered up the demolition of the Towers, we have evidence that the U.S. military stood down or disabled its air defenses and we have evidence that Bush, in Florida, his Secret Service people at least, knew he was not a target that day, so there's the U.S. Secret Service implicated, and we have all sorts of evidence against Cheney, so that seems like pretty strong evidence, and the question is, is there equally strong evidence, or stronger evidence, implicating Israel, the Mossad, and/or Zionists?

Bollyn replied:

> Ok, very good question. Kevin, it's actually, the evidence to support my thesis is actually many times stronger than any evidence showing that this is any sort of homemade American plot. First of all, you know, as an American, I find it absolutely beyond belief, I cannot believe, that any group of Americans would do something like this to their own people, to their own country, and for what reason, to make some stupid, disastrous war in the Middle East? It makes no sense. The argument cui bono, or, you know, for what reason – it strongly points to Israel.

We can skip the rest of this "argument" because whatever "evidence" Bollyn may have concerning Israeli foreknowledge (there does appear to be some, just as there is evidence of foreknowledge of Americans, Pakistanis, Germans, French, etc.), or even possible complicity, it is vitiated by his a priori exclusion of "Americans" as the perpetrators. This, as he says astonishingly clearly here (I would have expected him to be more clever), he simply "cannot believe." There you have it. This is the end of the story as far as this "truth-

---

[130] See http://noliesradio.org/archives/4961.

seeker" is concerned, just as it is, one must add, for many other Americans who "cannot believe" that their own government would do such a terrible thing to them.

I am not going to bother reviewing the many examples disproving this naive point of non-view (google "false-flag terrorism"). The point is that Bollyn, one of the most best-known and "respected" (that is, among his ilk) "anti-Zionists," reveals very clearly here that the basis for it is denial – the "inability," which is to say the refusal, to believe that his own government is responsible for 9/11, despite the mountain of evidence that has accrued to justify this conclusion. No, Bollyn says, I "cannot believe" that. It is easier for him to believe that "Shimon Peres and his gang of nuclear criminals are the real architects behind the false-flag terror of 9-11," as he writes in his comment on the interview.

"Barrett asked me," he continues, "how such a small group can dominate and control such a large nation as the United States. 'They run the whole show,' is how I would answer this question in one sentence. They control the media that informs Americans, the law enforcement agencies, the courts, the money, and the political process. This control is maintained by their exclusive secret society, B'nai B'rith and their allegiance to their collective."

At this point, the degree of irrationality is such that virtually anything and anybody can be identified as the "small group" in charge, and indeed, many candidates have been proposed (e.g., Illuminati, Bilderbergers, Bohemian Grovers, Skull and Bonesers, P2, the CFR, the Trilateral Commission, the Federal Reserve, Freemasons, Martians, reptiles, etc.). Anything goes because the most logical conclusion, on the basis of the evidence, has been eliminated from the beginning.

Here too is the perfect illustration of how "anti-Zionism" (not to say anti-Semitism) fits hand in glove with nationalism. It is a a short step, in fact no step at all, from "I cannot believe Americans could do it" to "America First." (Go to William Fox's amfirstbooks.com and you will soon discover how racism fits into the same mentality.)

Finally, but not least importantly, all of this plays so blatantly into the hands of the primary suspect, the U.S. government, that complicity, either alternatively or in addition to mental illness, must be suspected. If Americans are indeed the perps, what better agents for their defense could there possibly be than people who "cannot believe" that Americans could be guilty? With enemies like Bollyn, the CIA needs no friends.

The anti-Zionists are only one faction of the "evil elements did it" crowd. There is a broad spectrum of people who, less candidly perhaps than Bollyn, admit the complicity of Americans but in the end still find the "small group" of controllers if not outside the U.S. government, somewhere secretly ensconced within it, infesting it like a virus, or as Peter Dale Scott (in *The Road to 9/11*) probably most convincingly puts it, *parallel* to it. I have referred to this as "Deep State Doublethink" (see earlier in this volume) because it is illogical, and Orwellian, to assume the coexistence of a Deep (bad) State and a Public (good) State vying with each other for power, as Scott suggests. Both of these contradictory ideas cannot be true. If there is a Deep State, it is the state, and there is no Public State; you can't have both.

With due respect for Scott's scholarship, which cannot fail to impress, it is unnecessary (albeit an intriguing academic exercise) to speculate about precisely who the bad guys are. We have a (nominal) public state, and we know who is supposed to be in charge. We know equally well, having been forced to this conclusion by the great preponderance of evidence (much of which Scott himself meticulously presents), that this is not the real chain of command, since commanders-in-chief do not order their own assassination (JFK) – or their personal jet to buzz NYC as a "publicity stunt,"[131] and it is hard to imagine GWB talking the Air Force into standing down for the attacks on 9/11. The evidence is clear; it is the conclusion that is lame. This too is denial.

I don't know how to fix the situation, but I don't think denial helps, whether in the most obnoxious form of scapegoating Jews or in the least noxious form of maintaining the fiction of a functioning democracy. Our society is moribund. It is on a fast track to an overt police state, most likely preceded by more 9/11's, more wars, more financial crises, more disease epidemics, and more holocausts of other kinds, unless we can wake up and stop the slide.

---

[131] See "Was the Air Force One Flyover a Warning to Obama?" in this volume.

Pulp Fiction

Sept. 21, 2009

Shakespeare said all the world's a stage, and we are but players – bit players, he might have added, although he preferred to write about the high and mighty. I don't know about the high and mighty, but to tweak the old bard a bit, I would say it is more like a novel we are living in, and a bad one at that. The *Warren Report*, the *9/11 Commission Report*, the "news" as it is fed to us 24/7 by the mass media, what is it all but pulp fiction, a never-ending penny dreadful hacked together by bullet-headed propagandists dedicated to no higher goal than keeping us turning the pages, day after day, scam after scam, disaster after disaster, with no end in sight. The story is not interesting or coherent, the characters abominable, the mysteries transparent, the plot obvious and predictable, but we keep reading because there is no alternative. This is what passes for reality, according to the assembled forces of the mass media, the government, academia and the "scientific community." Opposing them is the "truth movement," the name itself a pitiful reminder of our ignoble state, and infiltrated and splintered into a thousand pieces, as our martyred president (JFK) once vowed to do to his nemesis, the CIA.

Gone are the days when nobler pursuits were possible, unraveling the secrets of nature and exploring human nature and the meaning of our lives. No, a few hacks have turned us into slobbering addicts of the daily news, woofing and whining after every tidbit thrown to us to satisfy our hunger for the "truth": Who killed JFK? Who flew the planes? Were there any planes? How could the Air Force be defeated by box cutters? Etc. etc. This is what bothers me almost more than anything else. It is humiliating. They have stolen our reality. They are stealing our time. They have replaced the mystery of life with a whodunnit. They are not worthy, so far from worthy, but they have done it. How can I put it more vividly? They have defecated in the middle of our lives, and forced us to spend our time figuring out who did it, even though we know who did it. They did. The people writing this trash. We are under their complete control. We have no recourse. If we oppose them, we simply become villains in the story. This helps create tension, which is their strategy, the strategy of tension. It is a military operation.

If we just keep reading, as we are supposed to, we become victims, and we will die victims. Yet if we try to put it down, it will pick us up again, with the next murder, the next war, the next holocaust, and we are still victims.

There is a crucial difference between Shakespeare's metaphor and mine. Consider whom or what William might have thought to be the playwright, the director, the stage designers. Would he have suggested the CIA, the Queen's secret service, the Palace, the high and mighty themselves as a class, the wealthiest 1% (or less) of the population? No, these are our concerns. Shakespeare was asking who, or what, is God? We have been reduced to asking, "Who is playing God?"

As long as I'm mixing metaphors, I'll add one more: Plato's cave. I got this from Webster Tarpley (*Synthetic Terror*). This is more like it. Can you imagine Shakespeare's Jaques as one of Plato's prisoners? No. These two metaphors really don't mix. Now try it with us. We are the prisoners, watching the shadows on the wall. Even when we stand up and protest ("But these shadows are not real!") our shadows too are projected on the wall and become part of the performance.

I don't know where the exit is. I do know the performance is terrible, and I hate being part of it.

Not to end on a totally bleak note, the internet is a point of light, even in the Cave, if we can survive 9/11[132] and stave off complete government-corporate control (Internet2).

[132] See http://www.infowars.net/articles/august2008/050808i911.htm.

Brzezinski Censored (Again)

September 23, 2009

It's interesting to see how a story like this is handled. It first appeared on Sept. 23 in *The Daily Beast*, in Gerald Posner's blog.[133] Now, given not only Brzezinski's history but also Posner's, one would hesitate to see either of them as anything but mainstream. But Brzezinski obviously represents a faction of insiders who are at least sometimes at odds with Big Brother, especially, it seems, on the subject of Iran.

Brzezinski, whatever else one can say about him, does not seem to want a war with Iran, and has given us public warnings, first in Feb. 2007 about a possible false-flag event staged by the U.S. in order to bring it on,[134] and now about a possible Israeli strike.

The story was reported by ABC News online[135] and the Huffington Post,[136] and a few other less known online sources, but it did not make it to the online editions of the *New York Times*, CNN, the *Washington Post*, or (of course) Fox News. It was reported, however, by Iranian Press TV[137] and the *Jerusalem Post*.[138] (I heard about it from InformationClearingHouse[139] via my Facebook friend Alfons Olszewski.) I note that it has not made it to OpEdNews yet, either.

Why is this important? It should be obvious. First, as I said, it shows that there is dissension in the ranks of of the Inner Party (I can't improve on Orwell's terminology) on this point, and second, it shows that the Warmongers have the upper hand, which point is confirmed by the failure of the big time propaganda organs to report the story. They have obviously been told that it would not do to have a large portion of the population aware that an Israeli strike on Iran can easily be prevented by the United States, and that some factions of the ruling elite, even some close to the president, do not want a war with Iran.

This of course is the third reason why this is important. It is one more example, and a striking one, of how absolutely worse than worthless, how utterly evil, the mainstream press is.

---

133 See http://www.thedailybeast.com/blogs-and-stories/2009-09-18/how-obama-flubbed-his-missile-message/.

134 See http://wsws.org/articles/2007/feb2007/brze-f03.shtml. The only mainstream report I found was the AP story: http://www.astandforjustice.org/2007/02/02-01-12.htm. The Brzezinski text is here: http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2007/BrzezinskiTestimony070201.pdf. For background on Brzezinski see http://209.85.129.104/search?q=cache:J5FXKEFrXegJ:www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/080906_global_elite.shtml+Brzezinski+%22Project+for+a+New+American+Century%22&hl=de&ct=clnk&cd=20&gl=de.

135 See http://blogs.abcnews.com/politicalpunch/2009/09/zbig-brzezinski-obama-administration-should-tell-israel-us-will-attack-israeli-jets-if-they-try-to-a.html.

136 See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thomas-lipscomb/maybe-brzezinski-is-half_b_294990.html.

137 See http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=106765&sectionid=351020104.

138 The online link at the time of writing was http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull&cid=1253198162423.

139 See http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article23542.htm.

Prolegomena to a Theory of Ah

Sept. 28, 2009

A short story

After I wrote that thing about awe't[140] Reggie called. I had sent him a copy.

"What a pleasant surprise," I said. "It's been a few years." The last time I had seen him was at the documenta in 2007.[141] He was not impressed.

"Hey, let me call you back. It's much cheaper to call from here." I don't know why this is, but my calls from Germany to the States are much cheaper than the other way around. "It will just cost pennies if I call you." Cents, I should have said. Euros don't have pennies.

"No, don't worry about it." I let it drop. He could in fact afford it. He could probably afford to buy the phone company.

"I just want to talk a little about your piece."

"Oh, you read it?" My surprise was not feigned.

"Yes, it was interesting." Which is a way of saying "terrible."

"I guess you recognized yourself," I said.

"Of course."

"But I don't think anybody else will, do you?"

"No. And I wouldn't care if they did." I didn't believe him.

"For one thing, I'm not a billionaire."

"I guess that was a bit of an exaggeration." What's a few hundred million?

"What did sort of bother me was the implication that I don't care. I hope you don't really think that, because it's not true at all."

"Did I say that?"

"Well, you did imply it. That whole idea of art for art's sake, what Marcuse said and all, that's a very old and very flawed criticism. It wouldn't bother me normally, but it does hurt a little coming from you. I thought you knew me better than that."

"I didn't mean it as a criticism. I said I felt ambiguous about it. I actually envy people who can live that way, who can live for art."

"Oh sure, and there are people like that. I know a lot of them. Collectors, artists, critics, all different kinds of people. I'm just not one of them."

I was on the verge of apologizing. It was true. I had lumped Reggie in with the *l'art pour l'art* crowd.

"Did you know I lost a cousin on 9/11?" Reggie continued. "At the World Trade Center."

"No, I didn't. I'm sorry." There. I had apologized, though not for what I had actually done.

"That hit me very deeply. And I agree with you and everyone who wants a new investigation."

"Half of New York City."

"That's right. And I hope we get it. I've signed the NYC CAN petition, and donated as well."

"Well, that puts me in my place. I haven't donated anything. Ok, it's time for me to apologize. I do."

"That's not the point, Michael. There's nothing to apologize for. Nobody is going to know who I am. But like I said, you know who I am, and I'm just a little disappointed."

Now I was really beginning to feel bad.

"Reggie, my point was really not to criticize you, or take some sort of moral high ground. I was trying to express my own confusion. I wish I could live like an artist. Or like one of those that are above it all, or outside of it, or however you want to put it." No, I didn't. I was lying, and, as I realized too late, I was still putting him in that category of oblivious Beauty Worshipers.

"As I said, I know a lot of people like that. But why pick on artists? Aren't most people like that? Isn't everybody like that to a certain extent? You can call it denial if you like, but people need to get through the day. Maybe it's art for some, pizza for others, sports, what have you. If you want to spend your life wondering who

---

[140] See "Shock and Awe't," in this volume.

[141] An art exhibition: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Documenta.

killed JFK and who blew up the Towers, ok, have a nice life. How many people can do that? How many people want to do that? It's a matter of survival. Art is a way to survive. Baseball is a way to survive. Ice skating."

"Making money."

"Yeah, that too. What's your point? You're picking on art as some sort of special human activity different from everything else and insisting on political engagement. Why not pick on baseball players or ice skaters? My god, people involved with art are just people like everybody else."

"Well, that's just it, Reggie. I always thought art was something special."

"It is. But you seem to be confusing it with something else, like religion, maybe. You seem to resent artists who don't have the same political concerns and opinions you do with religious leaders in Germany who supported the Nazis."

"Now you're exaggerating a bit."

"Am I? Look. I'll tell you what I think about art. It's freedom. That's what it is, nothing more or less. You don't have to like it, or do it, or have anything to do with it. You're free, too. But you are the one making demands. You want art to be something it is not. Art is not politics. Period. There is no other way to say it."

"Despite Marcuse and those guys."

"Of course despite Marcus and those guys. What do they know? Who gives them the right to judge and make demands? If they want a certain kind of art, fine. They can promote it, or produce it themselves. You can do that, too. You want to put 9/11 on an urn, do it! Find a way to do it. But criticizing others for not doing it – and I'm not saying they haven't – is just very lame."

"I see your point, Reggie," I said lamely. "But aren't you oversimplifying just a little? I mean, you know much better than I do how much of a role money plays in the art world today."

"Of course it does. What else is new? That's always been the case. That's life. What does that have to do with anything?"

Somehow I felt we had come full circle. Reggie was winning the debate before I felt I was really in it. What was my point again?

"It's not really a matter of putting 9/11 on an urn." This is I how I had ended my article: How do you get that on an urn (with reference to Keats)?

"By the way, you're quite wrong about that. There are plenty of artists who have dealt with 9/11." He named a half dozen. I had not heard of any of them.

"It's not a matter of 9/11 itself..." I hesitated, because I knew what was coming next would be the beginning of the end of our conversation. "It's more like how you get '9/11 was an inside job' on an urn?"

"Oh jeez," Reggie groaned. "Come on. That's everywhere. You don't need it on an urn. You've got it on signs on the sidewalk, on thousands of internet pages. Books, movies..."

"Painting? Sculpture?"

"I'm sure there is work that deals with that." He did not offer any names this time. "Why shouldn't there be? No matter what you might think, this is still a free country."

"Still. Maybe not for long. Do you know of any exhibitions that deal with the political implications of 9/11?"

"Not offhand. Not at the moment. So what? What is there to be exhibited?"

"Well, that's my point."

"But Michael." He sounded exasperated, tired of dealing with this recalcitrant child. "Art is always a matter of two things: talent and discovery. It may be there and undiscovered. It may be there and you and I don't know about it. Neither one of us is omniscient!" He said this with emphasis, as if he were saying something very basic, which of course he was. "It may not be there at all. Yet. Maybe tomorrow it will be."

I decided to take a stand. Stick my neck right out on the block. "Ok, I'll put it this way. I don't think it is, and I don't think it will be. Not unless there is a huge change." I wanted to say "revolution," but I knew this would not help me make my point. It was hard enough to know what my point was myself. Words got in the way, especially words like *revolution*.

"I don't know about that. And with all respect, Michael, neither do you. You don't have a crystal ball." No, I didn't. The things I didn't have were piling up. No moral high ground, no omniscience, no crystal ball – who the heck did I think I was?

There was a pause. Then he said, "You seem to be obsessed with 9/11. I've read some of your work. You seem to have become a one-issue man."

I had to admit that that was pretty close to correct. That was also part of my point, but I didn't know how to get this across either.

"Have you read my thing about Pulp Fiction?" I said.[142]

"The movie?"

"No, I wrote an article called 'Pulp Fiction.'"

"No, I haven't read that one."

"That may get to the point better. I subtitle it 'We are living in a novel – a bad one.'"

"I'll make a note to read it."

"I'm saying if we are characters in a novel, how can we write novels?"

"I'm not sure I follow that."

I also use the allegory of the cave. You know, Plato?"

"Yeah, where the people are watching the shadows on the wall."

"Right. Well, we're the people."

"So?"

Exactly. So?

"We're trapped."

"Bollocks." The Briticism surprised me. Paying me back for Plato, I guess.

Fine when you've got a couple of hundred mil, or even one mil, to untrap yourself, I wanted very much to say. But it wouldn't have been fair. Actually, it would have, but it wouldn't have seemed like it. And appearances are everything. Here in the cave. Right? What?

"Maybe you should read my article."

"I will, I promise. And Michael, I have a suggestion. Why not try a work of art yourself. You used to write poetry, didn't you?" He was talking about our college days. I had also written some more recent stuff.

I still felt we were both missing the point. He wasn't getting it, or I wasn't making it, or both. Or there was no point.

"That's interesting," I said. "I was told the same thing by Lawrence Durrell, years ago."

"Oh, really?" Did I detect a slight change in his tone? More...what, interested?

"But he also said publishers were vultures." I had not asked Durrell what he meant by that. I should have. Since most of my work has been self-published, what did that make me? A flesh-eating, self-gnawing, bone-picking bird-bard.

"Vultures," Reggie repeated, noncommittally. "When did you meet him?"

"That was back in 1987, a few years before he died. I visited him in Sommières."

Durrell had used the exact same words: Try a work of art. Unbeknownst to him, I had, and proved it by tearing out an end paper of the copy of his *Collected Poems* that I had brought with me and on which I had transcribed "Homage à Lawrence Durrell," and handed it to him.[143] It was at the end of a long afternoon and several of the bottles of Rhine Hessen I had brought along. It was a kind of ritual. Tit for tat. I never found out what he thought of the poem. He did mention that the Algonquin was a hotel in New York, not a river. (I still like it better as a river.)

"I read the Alexandria Quartet," Reggie said. "I don't remember it as particularly political." Neither did I. "What do you suppose he meant by that – 'vultures'? That all great artists are dead? There's some truth in that."

"I'm not sure." I wasn't coming across as sure of very much of anything, I knew. Maybe it was better that way. Maybe that was my point. "It's not a nice image, though. Vultures are not pretty, and they eat dead meat."

"So do we. Or are you a vegetarian?"

"No, but I eat a fair amount of tofu."

I didn't say that Durrell had also said, in response to what I said, which must have been something like "Too bad we can't do without them" (this was pre-internet days): "Somebody has to tell you if it's any good."

"Vultures or not, they're part of the world, Michael."

"I appreciate what you're saying, Reggie, but I feel I haven't really gotten my point across. I don't blame you. I'm just not expressing it properly. Effectively."

---

[142] See "Pulp Fiction," in this volume.

[143] See Poems, this volume.

"How is Vee?"

"She's fine, thanks." He had met Vee when he came to Kassel. And your family?

"We're all fine. Surviving the rat race." A cut above survival, I would venture.

"Will you be coming to the next documenta?" I queried.

"When is the next one?"

"In 2012. It'd be great to see you again." I wasn't sure I meant it. Our worlds were very far apart, and this conversation was not bringing them any closer.

"Oh, I have no idea what my schedule will be like then. Maybe."

"I know you weren't very impressed with the last one."

"No, I must say I've seen better exhibitions. But you never know."

We parted on friendly terms, but I knew he wouldn't be coming to Kassel again. It had been a long time since our college days.

In German it is possible to have what they call an Aha-experience. I felt like I had had half of one.

Controlled Demolition as a Limited Hangout

Oct. 1, 2009

I have been saying this for several years (most recently in "9/11 Aletheia"), and the recent articles by Kevin Ryan[144] support my point. As I wrote in 2006[145]:

> Thus one can argue that it is in the interest of Big Brother to limit the discussion to the question of controlled demolition at the WTC.

Now, three years later, when everybody who is ever going to believe it (unless they hear it on Fox News) does believe it, thanks to the long-awaited and highly touted scientific proof of explosives at the WTC provided by the paper[146] published by Jones et al. last April (one of whose authors was Kevin Ryan), the limited hangout can begin its second phase. I am not saying that Jones or Ryan are government agents. I am saying they have been dealing with what Michael Green calls a tar baby – although he misidentifies it. (Green is one of those who most vociferously argue that "no plane [at least, no 757] hit the Pentagon" is the tar baby.[147])

I have not heard a single report of anyone being persuaded by the "definitive" thermite paper who was not already persuaded that the Towers came down by controlled demolition. It has made zero impact on the "scientific community," the government, and on the public at large, which should in itself validate my argument that "truthers" who insist on limiting discussion to this one – most obvious, to anyone who sees the WTC videos and has also seen videos of controlled demolitions – aspect of 9/11 are serving the interest of Big Brother.

What the thermite paper does seem to have signalled is the end of the "research" phase regarding explosives and the beginning of the "forensic" phase. Ryan provides us with enough suspects for placing the explosives in the Towers to keep "independent researchers" busy for many years. Let me list them, in the order they appear in the first two parts of his article (a third is yet to come) to make the point:

> Al-Qaeda operative Ramzi Yousef, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, Marsh & McLennan, Baseline Financial Services, First Commercial Bank, Fuji Bank, Mizuho Holdings, Deutsche Bank, AON Corporation, Chuo Trust, Washington Group International, Primark Corporation, Bankers Trust, Exco Resources, Oppenheimer & Co., Morrison-Knudsen, Komatsu, Aoki Construction, Special Devices Inc., In-Q-Tel, TASC, Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, General Dynamics, Halliburton, SAIC, Dresser Industries (now Halliburton), UBS, BCCI

and this is only from Part 1 – "approximately fifty people ... and their possible links to explosive technology and expertise," as Ryan begins Part 2. In Part 2 he adds Kroll Inc., Electronic Systems Associates, E.J. Electric Installation, Ensec International, Securacom Inc., Silverstein Properties, and a bunch of other names of people who, he summarizes, "were deceptive and/or corrupt, and appeared to have benefited from the attacks," who "were connected to each other and to the investigations into previous acts of terrorism and the terrorist financing bank BCCI," who "did major work for the Saudi Arabian government, or the royal family of Kuwait," or whose history "shows a level of greed and corruption that overshadowed all preconceptions about U.S. politics."

I have not read the article carefully, I confess, because the tar is sticking to my fingers, and my point here is not to question the accuracy of Ryan's research – nor, in fact, the value of it, for those who want to continue dealing with the tar baby. There is obviously plenty more work to do, and it is equally obvious, I think, that it will lead everywhere and nowhere. I would feel sorry for Ryan, who like Stephen Leacock's comic hero Lord Roland now wants to fling himself upon his horse and ride madly off in all directions, except that his previous behavior does not exactly qualify him as a naif. He joined in the denunciation of the 2008 effort by Joel

---

144 See http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20090713033854249 and http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20090813150853871.

145 See "The Onion Peeled," in this volume.

146 See http://stj911.org/press_releases/ActiveThermiticMaterial.html.

147 See "9/11 Aletheia," in this volume.

Hirschhorn et al.[148] to get Congress to look at aspects of 9/11 that (in Ryan's view) are "poorly defined, and highly implausible" because it "minimizes the chances that Congress would be willing or able to investigate the actual evidence for the demolition of three WTC buildings."

It could be that Ryan et al. have actually increased the possibility that Congress will investigate "the actual evidence for the demolition," and if and when that evidence is officially acknowledged, the door will be open, presumably, to further investigations of how the explosives got into the Towers. Enter Ryan's current foray into the murky networks of corporate and state intelligence networks. Imagine how long it will take Congress, comprised of people who are themselves hugely involved in such networks, to become "willing or able to investigate" any of this! If they will not take his physics seriously, how can he expect them to take his detective work about possible sinister connections among dozens of companies and individuals seriously? Or more to the point, why does he feel it preferable to point in this direction rather than to the further investigation of the physical evidence regarding many aspects of 9/11 other than controlled demolition?

For example, just to mention one such aspect, Pilots for 9/11 Truth[149] have just produced a video full of technical data that proves that either the data supplied by the NTSB regarding the speed and trajectory of the airplanes that supposedly crashed into the WTC is false, in which case, the narrator says, no one should set foot in an airplane again, or whatever hit the buildings was not a "stock, airline fleet, Boeing 767." Previous videos have said the same about Flight 77 that supposedly hit the Pentagon and Flight 93 that supposedly crashed in Shanksville (both 757s). This is hard, technical data that is at least as compelling as the evidence for explosives adduced by Ryan et al., and yet you can search in vain on the Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice site[150] – or Jim Hoffman's site(s),[151] to which STJ911 frequently links – for any sign that people who challenge the government line on Flights 77 and 93 (except for the possibility that it may have been shot down) are anything but "disinformation agents."

The latter, it should be said, though it seems to be a well-kept secret, would have to include David Ray Griffin, who has consistently presented evidence demonstrating the falsity of the official story of Flights 77 and 93, as well as 11 and 175. Griffin is far and away the most popular 9/11 "truther," and has been careful (and wise) to avoid the internecine squabbles among fellow truthers, but he presents a plethora of evidence about much more than controlled demolition that, if it came from anyone else, I am certain Hoffman and the Jones Boys (STJ911.org, whose spokesman is however a Girl named Victoria Ashley, who is close to Hoffman) would also denounce as "disinformation."

The Pilots are a conservative group, too, but they are not blind. Their data, at the very least, proves the official story of what happened on 9/11 with regard to all four planes is false. They try hard not to speculate, but what they are saying is that no 757s or 767s (at least, they will add, no unmodified planes, meaning no commercial jetliners) crashed on 9/11. This is the rocket science, for me – at least, airplane science – but the further conclusions based on this are not, even though the pilots refrain from saying them out loud. The planes were supposed to be ordinary jetliners. That is the official story. If they were not ordinary jetliners, not only is the official story false, but all of the questions about what really happened on 9/11 scream out at us for answers. We are at one fell swoop far beyond the question of demolition and the hopeless morass of the question of who put the explosives in the buildings.

This is true of many other aspects of 9/11, which as I say David Griffin and others have consistently presented but which Kevin Ryan and his associates at STJ911.org have consistently refused to deal with and aggressively demonized. (My reward for objecting to this patently unscientific behavior was to be thrown out of the organization.) Instead of chalking up the "proof" of thermite in the WTC dust as a (modest) victory and going on to more interesting questions, such as the questions the Pilots have taken on, questions which are much more likely to show the hand of the military in the events of 9/11, Ryan et al. want us to ride off madly in all directions after the bad guys he has discovered at the WTC, who are at the most small fry in the context of what happened on 9/11. Well, thanks, but no thanks.

---

148 See http://stj911.org/press_releases/Misrepresentation.html.

149 See http://pilotsfor911truth.org/.

150 See http://stj911.org/.

151 See http://911research.wtc7.net/.

The "4,000 Jews Forewarned" Nonsense Again

Oct. 2, 2009

I am posting this here (and on Kevin Barrett's blog,[152] where he brought it up, because I am tired of repeating it.

May, Smith, Fetzer and Fox wrote on Aug. 3, 2009[153]:

> According to the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz*, New York's Jewish community was tipped off to the WTC attacks of 9/11 hours in advance.

When I questioned this, Fetzer came up with his source, which turned out to be not Ha'aretz but a Greek weekly called *A1*, which is the organ of a right-wing party called Popular Orthodox Rally and whose president is Georgios Karatzaferis. The Wikipedia article[154] about Karatzaferis says:

> Karatzaferis and his media (Teleasty channel, A1 newspaper) have been repeatedly accused in Greece of harbouring an extremist far-right, xenophobic and chauvinist agenda. At various times, he has made controversial statements laden with populist, homophobic, racist, chauvinist and anti-semitic content (including a reference to the "myth of Auschwitz"), as reported by newspapers.

What Fetzer[155] calls "prima facie proof that these two articles did appear in those Israeli papers" (*Ha'aretz* and *Yediot Ahronoth*) is the fact that this claim appeared in *A1*. He proceeded to viciously attack me, accusing me of having an "agenda" and being an "anti-anti-Semite" – which by the way I take as a compliment even though I doubt that he intended it as one. (And no, I'm not Jewish, if anyone thinks that is relevant.)

The only prima facie evidence of anything is that 1) Fetzer et al. falsely attributed the claim to *Ha'aretz* rather than to *A1*, and 2) *A1* falsely attributed the claim to *Ha'aretz* and *Yediot Ahronoth*, and 3) no Israeli newspaper (or any other newspaper of repute) published this claim.

What does seem to have been published in an Israeli newspaper, the *Jerusalem Post*, on Sept. 12, 2001, is this:

The Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem has so far received the names of 4,000 Israelis believed to have been in the areas of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon at the time of the attack.

You can google this whole quote and find many sources, including a U.S. government page[156] which links to a David Irving website[157] that purports to reprint the original online article in its entirety. Despite Irving's notorious reputation as an anti-Semite, to his credit he does not grossly misconstrue the quote as others have done, but "merely" characterizes it as an "exaggeration." I have not been able to find the text on the *Jerusalem Post*[158] online archive, which is somewhat disconcerting, but given the number of secondary sources that report it (819 Google hits for the entire quote), including, as I say, the U.S. government, I tend to believe this story actually did appear in the *Jerusalem Post*. Nevertheless, for Jim Fetzer's edification, one cannot call this "prima facie" evidence that this article actually appeared either, since the original seems to have disappeared.

This is not a new story. What appears to have happened, beginning with a report on September 17 on a Lebanese Hezbollah-owned satellite television channel (Al-Manar[159]), is that the original quote about the number of Israelis estimated to be living near the WTC and the Pentagon was distorted into "4,000 Jews failed to report for work at the WTC on 9/11," or some variation thereof such as we see in the quote from Fetzer et

---

152 See http://truthjihad.blogspot.com/2009/10/4000-jews-warned-jim-fetzer-i-talk-it.html.

153 See http://www.amfirstbooks.com/IntroPages/ToolBarTopics/Articles/Featured_Authors/may,_captain_eric/May_works/May_2009/Capt._Eric_H._May_20090803_with_Maj_William_Fox%3B_Dr._James_Fetzer%3B_Nuclear_Obama%27s_%60Vibrant_Response%27.html.

154 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georgios_Karatzaferis.

155 See http://truthjihad.blogspot.com/2009/10/4000-jews-warned-jim-fetzer-i-talk-it.html.

156 See http://www.america.gov/st/webchat-english/2009/April/20090430132244atlahtnevel4.020327e-02.html.

157 See http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/02/10/JerusPost120901.html.

158 See http://www.jpost.com/.

159 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-Manar.

al. above. This, we will recall, is the same canard that cost Amiri Baraka[160] the poet laureateship of the U.S. (and which he, like Fetzer, refuses to retract).

It would have been easy enough, and much more sensible, to admit his mistake, but to my great dismay Jim Fetzer insisted on attacking not only me for challenging him, but also Elias Davidsson and Kevin Barrett for agreeing with me. He will no doubt attack me again when he reads this. Too bad. I have defended him on other issues (see "9/11 Aletheia," "The Truth Wars," and "Troo Wit Troot," in this volume), and responded moderately and gently to his account of our disagreement that he posted on OpEdNews[161] (but subsequently changed to exclude the references to me), but one has to draw the line someplace.

I stand by my opinion that regardless of what if anything the Israeli government had to do with 9/11, anti-Semitism is a mental illness, a syndrome of denial, and a thorn in the side of the truth movement.[162] But this particular disagreement is not a matter of opinion. It is a quite straightforward matter of fact, at least it should be, and failure to agree on something this straightforward is extremely disheartening. I actually like Jim Fetzer (when he is not calling me names) and respect most of the work he has done, but on this issue he is unreasonable, not to say crazy (as Kevin put it).

---

160 See http://www.thetalkingdrum.com/amiri.html.

161 See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Is-9-11-Research-Anti-Sem-by-Jim-Fetzer-090615-95.html.

162 See "9/11, Anti-Semitism and Denial," in this volume.

Precautionary Principle aka Crimestop

Oct. l7, 2009

Frank Legge's recent paper[163] on "What Hit the Pentagon" is a travesty of logic and common sense.

In Chapter 4 of the last part of *1984*, when Winston is trying to learn to love Big Brother, he suddenly catches himself thinking that there is a real world, that there are laws of nature, and that all is not hallucination. He quickly disposes of this "fallacy," though, realizing that

> it ought never to have occurred to him. The mind should develop a blind spot whenever a dangerous thought presented itself. The process should be automatic, instinctive. CRIMESTOP, they called it in Newspeak.

Dr. Legge of Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice[164] calls it the "precautionary principle." The dangerous thought is that a 757 (AA Flight 77) did NOT hit the Pentagon:

> Application of the precautionary principle would result in investigators taking care to avoid the assertion that the 757 did not hit the Pentagon (p. 13).

Why is this assertion dangerous? Because it might someday be proved wrong – which is to say, it might someday be proved that a 757 DID hit the Pentagon.

Do you follow so far? No? Well, that's only natural because this is a very scholarly argument. Let me try to explain.

You see, Frank does not believe the official story that a 757 hit the Pentagon; at least, he does not say that he believes it:

> Please note that I do not say anywhere in the paper that a 757 hit the Pentagon (p. 1).

In fact, he believes that "the evidence for what hit the Pentagon is contradictory," and that this "contradictory evidence has been deliberately provided" (p. 13). Provided by whom? He doesn't say, but it is clear that he means the *authorities* (a word that occurs seven times in the essay, referring to U.S. federal agencies such as NIST, the NTSB, and the 9/11 Commission). He summarizes with "two essential points" (p. 13):

> 1. Nothing should have hit the Pentagon. This implies that a stand-down order existed, as appears to be confirmed by Mineta's testimony to the 9/11 Commission.
>
> 2. The authorities could easily show us what hit the Pentagon but they do not. This implies that the provision of contradictory information is deliberate and has a purpose.

Now pay attention, because after these two "essential points" it is difficult to go back and recapture Legge's "major" and "minor" hypotheses. Let's start with the minor one:

> The minor hypothesis of the paper is that there is no scientific proof that a Boeing 757 did not hit the Pentagon (p. 1).

There is no scientific proof that a 757 hit the Pentagon, Frank is telling us, the government has lied to us and purposely given us contradictory information to confuse us, should have shot down whatever it was if anything did hit the Pentagon, and could easily prove that a 757 hit the Pentagon if it actually did but deliberately chooses not to. This is quite a mouthful, but it's nothing new. Better scholars than Frank Legge, e.g., David Ray Griffin, have been saying this since at least 2004 (and a lot more understandably). Most recently, Griffin devotes an entire chapter of *New Pearl Harbor Revisited* (2008) to the evidence that Flight 77 did not hit the Pentagon.

Legge does not attack Griffin, however, which could have something to do with the fact that Griffin is the most widely read and respected of all 9/11 "truthers," so you would have to have guts to take him on. You

---

163 See http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2009/WhatHitPentagonDrLeggeAug.pdf.

164 See http://stj911.org/.

have to have some guts to take on Pilots for 9/11 Truth,[165] too, I guess, especially if you are a chemist with no aeronautical expertise, so I give Legge credit for boldness, but since I cannot evaluate the technical data I tend to give more credence to a group of pilots (now numbering more than 3,400) than to one chemist.

I am not an idiot, however, and I can (usually) recognize when I am being jived. In this case, I can recognize it because, as I wrote just a few days ago,[166] I have been hearing this nonsense since at least 2004 and writing about it since 2006. The "argument" has remained remarkably uniform: Don't question Big Brother on the Pentagon because someday he might show us one of those videos and make us "truthers" a laughing-stock. Legge's version:

> As stated above, the authorities could easily show what hit the Pentagon, as they have many video tapes of the event. That they choose not to do so must be because confusion serves their purpose. The situation to bear in mind is that the perpetrators may be keeping evidence in reserve which will prove that a 757 did hit the Pentagon. This evidence would function as their insurance policy. If they feel endangered by the progress of public opinion toward demanding a new investigation, and realizing that this will likely lead to criminal charges and convictions, they will produce this evidence. As many members of the 9/11 truth movement believe that no 757 hit the Pentagon, this evidence will throw the movement into disarray and create crippling loss of credibility over issues which are far more important. It will become very difficult to argue our prime evidence convincingly, that explosives were used at the WTC.
>
> Those who are not of the opinion that a 757 hit the Pentagon should bear in mind that it is possible that they have been deliberately deceived by false evidence and have been set up by this evidence to serve the purpose of the perpetrators, when the time comes.

So David Griffin, Pilots for 9/11 Truth, and many thousands, if not millions or tens of millions, of the rest of us have been "deliberately deceived" into NOT believing the official story about the Pentagon. This is one too many NOTS for someone (Legge) who does not believe it himself, and who furthermore believes "nothing should have hit the Pentagon," that "the authorities" could have prevented it (if it happened) but did not, and could prove that it happened (if it happened) but do not. I repeat: No, says our scholarly co-editor of the *Journal for 9/11 Studies*, we must not say (though presumably we may believe it secretly) that it did not happen because we cannot prove that it did not happen, even though it has not been proved that it did happen because the authorities choose not to do so.

Let's try some analogies. Frank is telling us that there is no scientific proof that there are no aliens (extraterrestrials) living among us, no life on Mars, and no Santa Claus. Nor is there any scientific proof that you have never murdered anyone. If you're innocent, prove it. And you might as well move to Guantanamo while you're at it.

But we are only beginning to fathom the wisdom of Dr. Frank Legge. In answer to critics who faulted earlier versions of his paper (this is version no. 5) for having "no hypothesis" and being "therefore not a scientific paper," he informs us that in fact there are two. In addition to the "minor hypothesis" just discussed – that there is no proof that a 757 did not hit the Pentagon – there is also a "major" one, and by golly, it's a whopper:

> The major hypothesis is that various groups within the 9/11 truth movement are strongly asserting contradictory views and hence weakening the credibility of the movement as a whole. The damage is exacerbated if the supporters of these views not only disagree but also attack one another.
>
> The best way to avoid the development of contradictory views is to scrupulously adhere to the scientific method and to promote to the public only those concepts which are shown to be soundly based. Multiple views will cause confusion which will be apparent to the target audience, the public. Many will conclude that the case for a new investigation into the events of 9/11 is weak if proponents cannot agree on significant issues.

Oh lordy. Multiple views! Contradictory views! Disagreement! Public attacks! Good heavens, the "target audience" may become confused! How terribly, terribly unscientific! Science means agreement, or at the least a pretense of agreement! We must "scrupulously adhere to the scientific method" by having one opinion, and one only, namely mine.

---

[165] See http://pilotsfor911truth.org/.

[166] See "Controlled Demolition as a Limited Hangout," in this volume.

Not even Orwell gives us a better example of CRIMESTOP than this. I am appalled. On second thought, I am happy for this outrageous and transparent demonstration of illogic and obfuscatory intent on the part of a core member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice, from whose ranks I am more proud than ever to say I was summarily and wordlessly ejected after I published "9/11 Aletheia"[167] some months ago.

[167] See earlier in this volume.

No Planes

Oct. 30, 2009

The floccinaucinihilipilification of no-planes theory (that no planes crashed on 9/11) has proven to be not only – how can I say it – floccinaucinihilipilificatious, but wrong. This applies to the WTC as well as to Shanksville and the Pentagon. There are two reasons for this conclusion.

1. The argument that any theories beyond controlled demolition (of the Towers) would compromise the theory of controlled demolition is false because that theory has now become as much of a fact as it is ever likely to become, thanks to the Jones Boys (stj911.org), and there is no evidence that it has made any impact at all. I know of no one who changed his mind about the question after reading the "definitive" thermite paper by Jones et al. They either believed it before they read it (e.g., after seeing the videos, since as Dan Rather said on air at the time they look exactly like all the other controlled demolitions that we have seen videos of), or they don't believe it now any more than they did before and never will until Big Brother says it's ok.

2. Despite repeated efforts by Aidan Monaghan[168] and others to get the government to give us some proof that ANY of the remains (including passengers and hijackers) of the airliners that supposedly crashed on 9/11 have been verified, all we have to date is Big Brother's word. Yes, they tell us, four planes crashed, and these are the planes, and these are the passengers, and these are the hijackers. They do not give us, however, a scintilla of physical evidence for any of it.

Oh yes, they have it all, locked up somewhere, but it is "exempt from public exposure." All we have are videos and eyewitnesses, and there is plenty of controversy about both. The videos, it should be noted, do not include the 80-odd government-held videos of the alleged Pentagon crash, except the one they did release, which only shows a puff of smoke and nothing remotely resembling an airplane.

Even without considering the evidence for video fakery and the contradictions in the eyewitness testimony, one thing is certain: This is the first time in the history of aviation that a commercial airliner has (supposedly) crashed, on land (vs., say, in the Bermuda Triangle), where there has been any doubt at all about whether or not it actually happened, and where the physical evidence proving that it happened has been deliberately secreted away and withheld from public or independent scrutiny. And this unique event happened not once but four times on 9/11!

So why floccinaucinihilipilificate about those who question whether these plane crashes took place? There was a crime – four crimes, in fact – so haven't the "leading" truth dogs been barking up the wrong dogs? Shouldn't we all have been barking at Big Bro, and Big Bro only, from the get-go? In this story, unlike the Sherlock Holmes story, some dogs (no-planers) are barking because they don't see anything (any convincing evidence of plane crashes), and others are barking even louder to get the other barkers to shut up.

Woof, woof, say the no-planers, all we have are doubtful videos and contradictory eyewitnesses, some lists of people who seem to be missing (except for some of the hijackers, who have long since reported in alive and healthy), and some photos of one or two of the ca. six million time-stamped and uniquely traceable airplane parts that "vaporized" on impact (an aviation first), but no evidence that these people or these parts had anything to do with the planes that supposedly crashed on 9/11. Woof woof woof, say the others. Shut up about that. You'll make us look bad. In good time, we will present our carefully considered, peer-reviewed woof – which, it is true, is completely irrelevant to what you are woofing about (since buildings can be and usually are controllably demolished without planes hitting them, as in the case of WTC 7) – but we feel your woofing and our woofings are discordant. Your woofing detracts from ours, and ours is more important because when they hear us they will all come running. They will not be able to ignore us any longer.

Well, that time has come and gone. Has anybody heard the clackety-clack of righteous soldiers, congresswimps, or media hacks rushing to the cause of the Truth of Controlled Demolition? Has there even been a pitter-patter? In fact, haven't we just heard the sound of jackboots clomping madly in the opposite direction, with the summary rejection of the will of 80,000 New Yorkers to have a new investigation (NYCCAN)?

---

[168] See http://www.911blogger.com/blog/2074.

It has been proved beyond reasonable doubt that nanothermite was used (perhaps along with other things) to bring down the Towers. Now it is time for something else. It is time to prove beyond reasonable doubt that there were in fact four plane crashes on 9/11. Not time to prove that they DIDN'T happen, which is what the plane-huggers demand of the no-planers.[169] Time to prove that it DID happen. And that is the government's job, not ours.

Show us the time-stamped parts, the black boxes with the serial numbers on them, and the records of the DNA examinations and the chain of custody, all of which is standard procedure in the investigation of such matters – except in the case of 9/11. Show us the credit card records of the passengers who bought tickets, or did they all pay cash (another first in aviation history)? Surely some passengers used or ordered rental cars in addition to the hijackers – the story of which[170] is as full of holes as all the rest of what Big Bro has told us.

Yeah, it happened, says Big Brother. Didn't you see it on TV? Case closed.

Woof, woof, woof.

---

[169] See "Precautionary Principle aka Crimestop," in this volume.

[170] See Griffin on this: http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=8937.

Hello Vietnamistan, Goodbye Obama

Nov. 13, 2009

If anyone had told me back in Reagan's days that his Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and a *Wall Street Journal* editor, Paul Craig Roberts, would become one of my favorite columnists, I would have laughed. Now Roberts puts more truth into one essay (e.g., "The Evil Empire"[171]) than you could glean rummaging through the entire WSJ archive. Likewise if anyone had told me I would agree with Maj. Gen. Albert Stubblebine,[172] the commanding general of the United States Army Intelligence and Security Command[173] from 1981 to 1984, when he would later say that 9/11 was an inside job, or with Lt. Col. Robert Bowman,[174] former Vietnam combat pilot and Director of Advanced Space Programs Development for the U.S. Air Force in the Ford and Carter administrations, or with Morgan Reynolds,[175] George Bush's chief economist for the United States Department of Labor in 2001-2002, who believe and say the same thing, I would have found the idea ludicrous.

If anybody had told me back in Vietnam days that Senator Robert Byrd, who supported that illegal and immoral war, would become one of the bravest and most eloquent opponents of the current and even more illegal and immoral – if that is possible – Terror Wars, I would have questioned his sanity. There are many, many examples[176] of former servants of the empire having become, especially since 9/11 and the start of the fraudulent Terror Wars, what they would probably themselves have called a few years earlier "radical dissidents." Many former "conservatives" have left Noam Chomsky in the dust in the distance they have traveled from center stage to join the "wild men in the wings," as McGeorge Bundy referred to Chomsky et al. in 1967.

It would seem that a revolution has taken place, but it is a strange kind of revolution, because nothing much has changed. Here we are again in the middle of a "quagmire" that has cost more than a million lives (4,600 of them Americans[177]), and almost $700 billion, threatening to cost another $179 billion[178] in 2010 and with a "liberal" president about to send in tens of thousands of additional troops.[179] Some of us "radical dissidents," in the permanent state of frustration and dismay that an unfortunate predilection for old-fashioned "family values" such as truth and justice condemns us to, are fond of saying that we must change people's minds before we can change the world. But that revolution of the mind, if the polls I've seen are not mistaken, has in fact taken place. What happens now?

There are two possibilities, as I see it: 1) nothing, i.e., things continue as they are because it really doesn't matter what people think since Big Brother already has us by the balls, or 2) this is the calm before the storm. The latter possibility, as seen from the Fox News perspective, may be brought on not only by "terrorism" but also by "socialism," as rabble-rousers like Glenn Beck[180] are screaming at us. However illogical and vapid such propaganda is, it serves a purpose: when the day comes, when martial law is declared, we should not be too surprised, or wonder about the reasons. It may not even be necessary by 2014 (in Glenn Beck's scenario) to connect the next 9/11, economic collapse, disease epidemic, or other catastrophe to fictive "terrorists" like the 19 Arabs or crazed "socialists" like President Obama. Who will be wondering and analyzing why it happened, once it does? We will be glad to have toilet paper and a handful of mush, like millions of other serfs on the planet.

Given only these two choices, one would hope for the first. After all, life in the Brave New World Order ain't that bad. At least we have toilet paper. We'll need a lot of it to keep our consciences clean. Or maybe not. Our age, the age of the truth movement, the antiwar movement, the single-payer health insurance movement,

---

171 See http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Evil-Empire-by-Paul-Craig-Roberts-091105-748.html.

172 See http://world911truth.org/major-general-albert-stubblebine-towers-fell-down-because-of-explosives/.

173 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Army_Intelligence_and_Security_Command.

174 See http://911truthpedia.org/wiki/Robert_M._Bowman.

175 See http://nomoregames.net/.

176 See http://patriotsquestion911.com/.

177 At the time of writing; see http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/ for current figures.

178 See http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article23930.htm.

179 See http://www.wsws.org/articles/2009/nov2009/aftr-n09.shtml.

180 See http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,498765,00.html.

the save Social Security movement, the decriminalize marijuana movement, the yes-we-can movement, etc., may become known to historians as the most constipated of all time. Never before, they will say, have so many wanted to do so much, and done so little.

The Show Trial

Nov. 24, 2009

The flyer[181] by Jon Gold[182] superimposing the blood-curdling physiognomy of the former Vice-President of Sneers on the hirsute torso of Shake Mohammed[183] is cute, and may get some laughs, but it may also get some people arrested. As Paul Craig Roberts,[184] who has more cojones than a whole truckload of "truthers," has eloquently pointed out, this is indeed a show trial, and rather than allowing themselves to become part of the show, which is what will happen if they parade around with Funny Flyers and strident chants of "Inside job!" aimed at nobody in particular, "truthers" should take concerted and responsible action. For example, why not distribute a flyer summarizing the lack of evidence that ANY hijackers were on board the planes, as David Griffin[185] and Elias Davidsson[186] have argued? How can the man be tried for "masterminding" a crime the actual perpetrators of which, even if they were alive (as some of them have been reported to be), could not be found guilty on the basis of the evidence the U.S. government has so far presented?

Now is the time for the leaders of the "truth movement," including Jon Gold and his incognito colleagues and cheerleaders at 911blogger.com (e.g., "Reprehensor," "Arabesque," "George Washington"), to come out of the woodwork and present the evidence, rather, the lack of it, that in any reasonable trial would exonerate KSM rather than use him, as Roberts says, "to complete the corruption of the American court system." This is precisely the opportunity for a "new investigation" that the "reputable" (read "conservative") "9/11 truth" organizations have been demanding for years. I hope to see the management and staffs of 911blogger.com, 911truth.org, 911Research.com and stj911.org, as well as their members and supporters, and not just the kids from WeAreChange, out in force when that kangaroo court convenes in New York.

But I don't think that is what we'll see. What we'll see is a quick trial and conviction, speedy execution, and hardly a whimper from "truthers," who will be glad to go back to their "research," their conferences, their videos, their books and articles and websites, where they can continue their passionate call for the "new investigation" that has just taken place right in front of their noses.

These will be the same passionate reformers who balked at the Impeach Bush-Cheney movement and refused to join forces with the antiwar movement, even after the 2006 election when the Democrats won the House, the same passionate reformers who call for "investigation" but shoot their own members in the back[187] when they actually try to have such an investigation, and slander their colleagues[188] who dare to get too much attention or go beyond what they themselves are willing to investigate or even discuss (which is very little, i.e., controlled demolition, period).

KSM, rest in peace. He's already dead, and so is the "truth movement."

---

[181] See http://home.comcast.net/~gold9472/cheney_suspect.pdf.

[182] See http://www.opednews.com/populum/diarypage.php?did=15059.

[183] See my poem "Shake, Mohammed," in this volume.

[184] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/A-Trial-That-Will-Convict-by-Paul-Craig-Roberts-091123-597.html.

[185] See http://davidraygriffin.com/articles/was-america-attacked-by-muslims-on-911/.

[186] See http://www.aldeilis.net/english/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1614&Itemid=107.

[187] See http://stj911.org/press_releases/Misrepresentation.html.

[188] See "9/11 Aletheia," in this volume.

Have URL, Will Travel

Dec. 9, 2009

When Geocities offed itself a few weeks ago, taking 32 megs of me with it, my optimism about the internet suffered a hefty, but also healthy, blow. I had learned, often the hard way, about the ephemerality of digital media, but it's one thing to know something and another to do something about it. In this case, I don't think there was anything I could have done about it except transfer my site to another host,[189] which I have now done after the fact, but nothing could have saved the broken links to "geocities.com/mdmorrissey," now as useless as call numbers at the Royal Library of Alexandria. Well, not quite, since the enterprising reader can still find me by googling my name, but those links are also disappearing rapidly (from 10,500 a couple of weeks ago to 8,070 at last count).

I own my domain name (www.mdmorrissey.info) until 2014, so even if I get whacked again I can regenerate. Still, this incident brings home the stark fact of the matter: everything, absolutely everything, in cyberspace can disappear at any time in a reverse Big Bang that would do much more than send us back to the Paper Age because so much of what used to be on paper is now stored digitally. Lawrence Lessig has warned us that such a catastrophe, which he dubs i9/11, is inevitable: [190]

> Whether a single event, or a coordinated event, whether intentional, or accidental, it is simply a matter of time before a catastrophic network event happens. And when it happens – think of it as a kind of i9/11 event, but the bad guys are not Al-Qaeda – will we be prepared for the inevitable Patriot Act response? Are we better prepared than civil libertarians were when we were hit with the U.S.A. Patriot Act? Have we even framed the right debate?

I am sure plenty of techies will dispute this, but my gut tells me he is right. It can all die wholly or partially, instantly or a little bit at a time, some of it possibly recoverable and some not, but there is no denying that the internet is much more precarious than the Royal Library of Alexandria, whose precise fate remains mysterious[191] but did manage to survive at least several hundred years. How much of what is now on the internet will be around even one hundred years from now? It seems that the more sophisticated our inventions get, the more short-lived they are. Stone outlives parchment outlives old paper outlives modern paper outlives vinyl outlives tape outlives CDs, and it's a good bet that whatever comes next will follow the same pattern.

It's also a pretty good bet that if there is anything left of me in 2109 it will be made of paper, and I am grateful to Geocities for making this clear. I have reestablished my cybernetic self for the time being, but it is illusory to think it is for anything more than that. The first order of business, then, is to make paper copies, preferably several, of everything I want to keep. The second is to ask myself, yet again, "What am I doing here?" The question deserves an answer. *I* deserve an answer! Like millions of other people, I have invested a big chunk of my life in cyberspace, and I would not like it to be for nought.

All right. First of all, there is the old saw that teachers use to console themselves for years of ill-rewarded drudgery: If you can influence just *one* student... The same applies to our work on the net. The downside is that we rarely find out whom we have influenced or how. The idea that by writing down our thoughts we are preserving something of value for our great-great-grandchildren is more comforting, but this has nothing to do with the internet. Those thoughts will be much safer on paper.

The second reason for writing on the internet is quite a bit more abstract and speculative, and probably comes from having watched *The Curious Case of Benjamin Button* last night on TV. The movie I found sad and depressing, but the conventional notion of being "born again" is glorious, and that is more what I have in mind. William James famously described the world of the baby as a "great blooming, buzzing confusion," and that seems like a good description of the internet as well. If there was a way to measure "confusion," I think we would find it blooming and buzzing much more vigorously today than 20 years ago, thanks entirely to the internet, and we might want to call it something else, like "diversity of thought." If that is what the internet

---

189 Now Google sites.

190 See http://www.siliconvalleywatcher.com/mt/archives/2008/08/i911_us_governm.php.

191 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Library_of_Alexandria.

offers us, I'll take it. I like the idea that the internet has allowed us to return, phylogenetically, to a primordial state similar to that of the small child, where reality is up for grabs.

We do have a lot more choices these days. Education and "tradition" still steer us into the grooves worn by the mass media, but we can jump the tracks much more easily now. "Have URL, Will Travel," as I used to put it in my email signature block. I still like this motto because it can be read in two ways. The first way, the meaning I originally intended, is that if you have a website, you have an additional identity. You have an Ars Electronica – and that is not supposed to be what it sounds like to British ears but rather something noble, a *Lebenswerk* all the more meaningful because it can be constantly changing. Books are relatively immutable once they are tagged with an ISBN and put on the market. A website can change and grow infinitely. And the convenience of it! You don't have to keep repeating yourself, just refer people to your website. Know me, know my site. Been there, done that, said that, wrote that, then and there. I can go on to other things. I am free – and in the other sense, free also to travel virtually everywhere, wherever and whenever I like. All I need is an URL.

But Paladin was a loner. What I am working up to is that this new state of "confusion" the internet has brought us may truly change us collectively. I would like to believe this, and in fact I do believe it, but it means we are at war. The potential for great change is there, but the opposition to such change is also great. We need to understand this if we are going to fight effectively.

As an illustration, I recently joined a Facebook group called "We Will Not Pay To Use Facebook. We Are Gone If This Happens" that has 5,375,675 members. That's a lot of people. But it doesn't mean they will get what they want. If Facebook sells out and becomes a pay site, or just vanishes like Geocities, there will be 5.4 million disappointed people, period. The strength of numbers does not automatically translate into bucks, which is presumably why Facebook is considering the change, and it doesn't automatically translate into effective political action either. If it did, the world would be a very different place. The Bush/Cheney gang would be behind bars, the troops would come home, the bankers and brokers would have to give back the money, etc. There would be *democracy*!

Consider what would happen if those 5.4 million people actually put their heads together and figured out a way to turn their opinion into a political act. Suppose they figured out a way to actually *force* Facebook to stay free? Big Brother might be all for this particular action (FB provides an wonderful database for keeping track of large segments of the population), but what if 5.4 million people figured out a way to propose and elect public officials who would actually represent *them* instead of the wealthy and powerful? We have to remember that what we see as the *promise* of the internet is seen as a *threat* by those who, unlike Thoreau, do not want a government "by which men would fain succeed in letting one another alone" but a government which controls the rabblement and preserves the wealth and power of the upper class. The powerful few will never relinquish power to the many without a fight, and the internet is a major, perhaps the major, battleground. They will do everything they can to make it their tool, not ours. There may be an i9/11, there will be ever-increasing pressure to "monetize" websites and thus put a price tag on accessibility (Internet2[192]), they can flood the net with agents, impose censorship, disseminate spyware and malware, and no doubt do many other things that are cooking in the brains of their techie mercenaries, both military and civilian. It is scary to see that the Air Force,[193] for example, is proud to proclaim cyberspace as its next battlefield, on a par with air and space, and it would be naive to imagine that control of cyberspace, as part of "full spectrum dominance," means anything less than making sure that those millions of people using the internet never succeed in doing precisely what we want to do, which is turn our numbers into political action.

The fight to keep the internet and the fight to keep it free, then, are one and the same. If we allow it to go the way of television and the other mass media, we will have lost. Therefore, come what may, I will keep posting. It is an act of defiance and of faith – defiance of Big Brother and faith that good will prevail.

---

[192] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet2.

[193] See http://airforce.com/.

Transparent Underpants: MITOP Again

Jan. 11, 2010

The smoke from Mr. Abdulmutallab's underpants cleared extremely rapidly. Within three days we had an actual photo[194] of the charred briefs and the explosive 6-inch packet contained therein, complete with ruler for size verification. (Nevertheless one overzealous commentator estimated 8-10 inches, due to foreshortening.) In less than a week the word was out that it was an inside job.[195] The Keystone Kops could not have bungled the "intelligence" in this case any more spectacularly, and hilariously had it been a laughing matter, than the multibillion-dollar U.S. security agencies. The scale of the ineptitude was so great that mainstream journalist Richard Wolffe[196] reported that even the White House suspected a "conspiracy" rather than a "cock-up," despite the aptness of the British idiom, last heard when the BBC[197] used it to describe (6 1/2 years later) their astounding announcement of the collapse of WTC 7 on 9/11 23 minutes before it happened.

"It seems that the president," Wolffe said, "is leaning very much towards thinking this was a systemic failure by individuals who maybe had an alternative agenda." What agenda? Well, Wolffe said, it might be "a case of the agencies having so much rivalry between them that they were more determined to stymy each other or the centralized system rather than the terrorist threat."

This is about as lame an explanation as when the White House ended up dismissing the Air Force One fly-by over Manhattan last April as a "publicity stunt." They might just as well have blamed it on a hair in Louis Caldera's underpants, since he graciously took the blame even though the official report makes it perfectly clear that it was an Air Force operation from start to finish.[198]

Commentators more accustomed to thinking outside their underpants, like Barry Grey,[199] Bill Van Auken,[200] and Patrick Martin[201] of wsws.org, Webster Tarpley,[202] Wayne Madsen,[203] Tom Burghardt,[204] Pete Johnson,[205] Michael Collins,[206] and Paul Craig Roberts,[207] have picked up the ball in the meantime where Obama predictably dropped it ("our intelligence community failed to connect those dots"[208]) and see the incident as another false-flag operation, strikingly similar to 9/11, designed to justify ratcheting up the war on "terror" in the Middle East and at home. (The Patriot Act is up for renewal.)

But does this make any more sense? Surely if the "intelligence community" wanted to create a false-flag incident, they would be able to do so without leaving true flags all over the place pointing to themselves. Some will say I underestimate the stupidity of spooks, who no matter how much money and power you give them are still more like Maxwell Smart than James Bond, but I do not buy into "Stupidity Theory."[209] This is what is sold by the mainstream media, of course. If no plausible lie can be found, the affair is dismissed as "failing to connect the dots." This is the official explanation of 9/11 (the alternative, that 19 Arabs beat the crap out of

---

194 See http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/northwest-airlines-flight-253-bomb-photos-exclusive/story?id=9436297.

195 E.g., http://wsws.org/articles/2009/dec2009/plne-d28.shtml and http://www.infowars.com/false-flag-event-in-detroit-a-pretext-to-invade-yemen/.

196 See http://www.dailykos.com/story/2010/1/4/821905/-White-House-is-investigating-whether-intel-was-intentionally-withheld-re:-Flight-253-bomber.

197 See http://www.wtc7.net/bbc.html.

198 See "Was the Air Force One Flyover a Warning to Obama?" in this volume.

199 See http://wsws.org/articles/2009/dec2009/plne-d28.shtml.

200 See http://www.wsws.org/articles/2009/dec2009/pers-d31.shtml.

201 See http://wsws.org/articles/2010/jan2010/bomb-j04.shtml.

202 See http://tarpley.net/2010/01/06/obama-flubs-his-first-bay-of-pigs-moment-as-terror-moles-escape-purge/.

203 See http://onlinejournal.com/artman/publish/article_5424.shtml.

204 See http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=16780.

205 See http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Underwear-Bomber-More-by-pete-johnson-100106-351.html.

206 See http://www.opednews.com/populum/print_friendly.php?p=-Conspiracy-or-cock-up– -by-Michael-Collins-100108-664.html.

207 See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Is-Anyone-Telling-Us-The-T-by-Paul-Craig-Roberts-100108-422.html.

208 See http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-security-reviews.

209 See earlier in this volume.

the U.S. Air Force, being less plausible), of the Manhattan fly-by, of Gen. McChrystal's blatant disregard of the chain of command in announcing troop requirements in Afghanistan,[210] and of the underpants incident. Even wars can be sent down the rabbit hole this way; e.g., Vietnam was a "well-intentioned mistake," and despite all the evidence to the contrary, much clearer now than in the case of Vietnam, Iraq/Afghanistan is already getting the same treatment.

Transparency Theory makes more sense. In 2008 I wrote an essay redubbing it MITOP (Made It Transparent On Purpose)[211] in relation to 9/11, because the acronym fits well with and is actually the logical extension of LIHOP (Let It Happen On Purpose) and MIHOP (Made It Happen On Purpose), a distinction which now seems to have dissipated and never made much sense anyway.

I think MITOP applies to the underpants bomber as well: Yes, Big Brother did it, and *he wants us to know it*.

A good theory, in science, is one that explains more facts better than others. It fulfills the requirements of explanatory power and simplicity, or Occam's razor.[212] In other words, if the walking, talking, and quacking is duck-like, most likely we're dealing with a duck. We might not *want* it to be a duck, or we might be terrified that it will turn out to be a duck, but this is not science, and not rational. The facts will most often quack for themselves, if we allow them to.

I have always maintained that the best evidence that 9/11 was an inside job is the fact that it happened at all. This is the prima facie case: it could not have happened otherwise. 19 aeronautically-challenged Arabs with box cutters could not have defeated the U.S. Air Force unless the U.S. Air Force wanted it to happen. By the same simple and transparent logic, if indeed the official fairy tale were true, it would have been proven to everyone's satisfaction long ago. (The Pentagon videos would have been released, the plane and building debris found and examined, etc., etc.)

The thing about being logical is, once you start, you have to finish. You can't just say the most logical explanation for 9/11, or for Abdulmutallab's explosive underpants, is that it was an inside job because it is obviously and transparently so. You have to go further. You have to ask *why* it was obvious and transparent. Webster Tarpley, Wayne Madsen and the other conspiracy theorists should ask themselves this question. It is not the same question as "Why did they do it?" The question is "Why did they make it so *obvious* that they did it?"

I tried to answer this question in a previous essay, "MITOP and the Double Bind," by offering some amateur psychological analysis, and I'm glad to see that a professional, Bruce Levine, has written something along much the same lines ("Are Americans a Broken People? Why We've Stopped Fighting Back Against the Forces of Oppression"[213]). I called it a double bind; he calls it "abuse syndrome." Orwell and Huxley called it love of slavery, of one's own chains, in the one case because of fear and in the other because of soma-induced pleasure. The abuser, the oppressor, can also be variously characterized, as Big Brother, Mustapha Mond, or in the non-fictional world, the secret government, national security state, ruling elite, military-industrial complex (Eisenhower), "deep state" (Peter Dale Scott[214]), "rogue network or invisible government of treasonous and subversive moles inside the U.S. government" (Tarpley[215]), the "Unspeakable" (Jim Douglass,[216] after Thomas Merton), etc. I prefer the term "Big Brother" because it avoids the logical pitfalls inherent in the other terms,[217] and I think on the whole we are closer to Orwell's dystopia than to Huxley's.

Where is the hope in this view of reality, or as Levine calls it, the *morale*? Well, two points. First, BB may be a reality, but he is not Orwell's BB. He may wish to be, or something more "benevolent" like Huxley's Mustapha

---

210 See http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/barackobama/6259582/White-House-angry-at-General-Stanley-McChrystal-speech-on-Afghanistan.html

211 See "Transparency Theory" and "MITOP and the Double Bind," in this volume.

212 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occam%27s_razor.

213 See http://www.alternet.org/news/144529/are_americans_a_broken_people_why_we%27ve_stopped_fighting_back_against_the_forces_of_oppression?page=entire.

214 See http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=9289.

215 See http://tarpley.net/2010/01/06/obama-flubs-his-first-bay-of-pigs-moment-as-terror-moles-escape-purge/.

216 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=srstQVfVNEM.

217 See "Deep State Doublethink," in this volume.

Mond, but he is not. We are not fictional, either. The story is far from over. The situation is bleak, but there is wriggle room. And when, after all, in the history of mankind, has it ever been any different? The struggle against oppression, in one form or another, has been going on forever.

Secondly, our BB, the real BB, unlike Orwell's, is flawed, precisely because he is real, like ourselves. He may be able to pull off one 9/11, and maybe a second one, and then put the lid on – declare martial law, shut down the internet, jail all the dissidents – which would be terrible, but *what then*? He must know this doesn't work in the long run (the Nazis tried it), and the soma solution is totally untested and even riskier. The Inner Party is not completely unified (e.g., some want war with Iran,[218] some don't), so chances are he will stay with what has worked so far ("If it ain't broke, don't fix it"), and apart from having to tolerate articles like this, everything is going fine, from his point of view. The "war on terror" (i.e., for global control) is going well. Thanks to Abdulmutallab, BB can extend the war to Yemen and, most likely, renew the Patriot Act.

The more we become aware of what is going on, the better our chances. Noam Chomsky, whose work often seems to allow little room for optimism, cites the progress we have made since the 60s thanks to the grassroots work of anti war, civil rights, feminist, and environmental activists, as well as democratic movements in Latin America (e.g., Bolivia, Venezuela), as hopeful signs, and I would add to that the fact that we now have not only Chomsky and Zinn et al. but also people like Paul Craig Roberts on our side. The former *Wall Street Journal* columnist and "father of Reaganomics" would never have talked about Big Brother,[219] our loss of liberty and the rule of law[220] or written things like this a few years ago: [221]

> In truth, government represents private interests, those of the office holders themselves and those of the lobby groups that finance their political campaigns. The public is in the dark as to the real agendas.

Things *are* getting better. Yes, it is true that the Abdulmutallab incident serves to remind us of how far we have to go. If the bomb had exploded, how many of us then would be able to bear the fury of the backlash, which would fall not only on Yemen or "al-Qaeda" but equally if not more so on anyone attempting to "exonerate" them by suggesting "outrageous conspiracy theories" such as the possibility of an inside job? The bigger the catastrophe, the harder it will be to oppose the forces screaming for the blood of the designated enemy. Still, the better we understand this, the better off we will be.

---

[218] See "Brzezinski Censored (Again)," in this volume.

[219] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Waning-Power-of-Truth-by-Paul-Craig-Roberts-090618-235.html.

[220] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Liberty-Has-Been-Lost-by-Paul-Craig-Roberts-100105-429.html.

[221] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Is-Anyone-Telling-Us-The-T-by-Paul-Craig-Roberts-100108-422.html.

If I Met Poppy in a Pizza Parlor

Jan. 19, 2010

When I heard about the guy that ran into "Poppy" (George H.W.) Bush in a pizza place in Houston, cussed him out and posted a video about it on YouTube, of course I had to watch it. (Click here[222] fast; it seems to be disappearing.) The names turned out to be "murderous, Zionist piece of shit."

Mulling this over carefully, especially having just finished Russ Baker's exhaustive (and exhausting) *Family of Secrets* (2008), I wouldn't call the man a Zionist. I would even agree with the Secret Service agent who said, "This is unnecessary."

Baker doesn't use the word *Zionist* or *Zionism* once in his 579-page tome. Nor do the words *Israel(i)* or *Jewish)* occur anywhere, which is actually kind of strange, since in another book about Poppy those words occur 29, 43, and 21 times, respectively (Webster Tarpley, *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography*[223]), and in a book by Mearsheimer and Walt called *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (2007) the name *Bush* occurs 191 times, so there must be a connection.

I think I understand. Despite Baker's care to avoid the subject, it took Alexander Cockburn[224] only two sentences to dismiss Baker as a raving antisemite. After a one-sentence summary of Baker's book indicating "the strong possibility" that Poppy "was involved in assassinating President Kennedy, and that Bush was involved in staging the Watergate break-in (and the break-in at Dan Ellsberg's psychiatrist's) with the purpose of having these break-ins exposed and the blame placed on President Nixon," all of which is accurate enough, Cockburn concludes:

> We're back with the old notion of a secret, all-powerful permanent government, engendered in the WASP-nest of Skull and Bones, headquartered in Langley and locked in alternate collusion and combat with another permanent secret all-powerful government, *headquartered in Zion*..." (my emphasis).

Given this breathtaking leap, one can imagine what Cockburn would have said if Baker had actually *mentioned* Israel, Jews, or Zionism, much less called Poppy a Zionist. Murdering a million people, including President Kennedy, would pale in comparison to such an accusation. Baker must have decided, understandably, that he had enough against the Bushes without mentioning Israel, and that that would keep the worst of the conspiracy-theory-hunting hounds at bay, but he underestimated Cockburn.

Pinhead commentator Bill O'Reilly[225] disapproved of the "deranged" pizza parlor protester so strongly that he replayed the video for his 3.5 million viewers ("Can't let that stuff go"), which is deranged enough, but you expect that of O'Reilly. Cockburn's insanity, on the other hand, is of a different order. He is considered to be intelligent and well informed, but when it comes to "conspiracy theory," he goes whacko.

The same can be said, as we have read recently, of Cass Sunstein,[226] Obama's Minister of Truth. Anyone who thinks the Orwellian terminology is exaggerated cannot have read Crass Cass's truly diabolical treatise on "Conspiracy Theories,"[227] which is described (too) generously by Mark Crispin Miller[228] as the product of a "cool authoritarian mind," i.e., a cold-blooded fascist sycophant dressed up in Harvard lawyer's clothes, who "seems to have been crippled, his eyes sealed shut, by his eagerness to serve the powers that be" (cf. also Tencer,[229] Greenwald[230]).

Everything about this paper is revolting – from the inflated, obfuscatory language in which it is written to its twisted conclusions, all based on no evidence at all, just one sweeping unsupported generalization after

---

222 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nB5qa_ku3gM.

223 See http://www.kmf.org/williams/bushbook.html.

224 See http://www.counterpunch.org/cockburn12262008.html.

225 See http://www.infowars.com/oreilly-demands-deranged-bush-heckler-be-arrested/.

226 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cass_Sunstein.

227 See http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1084585.

228 See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Obama-s-Info-Chief-advocat-by-Mark-Crispin-Mille-100115-63.html.

229 See http://rawstory.com/2010/01/obama-staffer-infiltration-911-groups/.

230 See http://www.salon.com/news/opinion/glenn_greenwald/2010/01/15/sunstein/index.html.

another. Most revolting, and frightening, of all is that this kind of garbage is obviously highly valued in the rarefied academic legal circles where politicians look for their henchmen. Even worse, these lackeys can easily wind up on the Supreme Court. (Adrian Vermeule, Sunstein's coauthor, was a clerk to Supreme Court justice Antonin Scalia,[231] who will be best remembered for stopping the Florida vote recount in December 2000 which would have resulted in the election of the rightful winner, Al Gore.)

What Cockburn and Sunstein have in common is a total disregard for facts and information, for *evidence*, when it comes to "conspiracy theories." Sunstein's concern is with information *control*, which is the exact antithesis of discovery, transparency, open discussion, and the pursuit of truth. Having this man now as the head of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs is about as Orwellian as you can get.

Sunstein proposes using secret government agents to introduce "cognitive diversity" into "chat rooms, online social networks, or even real-space groups" to "undermine percolating conspiracy theories," secretly paying people who support the government's position to pose as "independent" experts, banning these theories by law, and imposing "some kind of tax, financial or otherwise, on those who disseminate" them. All these measures are not only revolting and Orwellian, but as Glenn Greenwald points out, probably illegal[232] as well, and yet Sunstein can "readily imagine" them. "Each instrument," he says, "has a distinctive set of potential effects, or costs and benefits, and each will have a place under imaginable conditions."

Sunstein is not going to resign just because he has been outed as a believer in thought control. On the contrary, this is no doubt one reason why he was appointed to his present position. Contrast this with the case of Van Jones,[233] who did have to resign because he once signed a petition demanding the truth about 9/11. And consider that these are the messages we are getting from a supposedly "liberal" Administration. A black man in the White House!

In such a climate, is it any wonder that I urge caution in using a word like *Zionist*? Throwing it around is not going to help the cause of peace or truth. On the contrary, it only serves to fuel the insanity of the Cockburns, the Sunsteins, and the David Dukes[234] – all of whom in this case serve each other's ends. I have weighed in a couple of times before[235] on the dangers, and the pathology, of antisemitism in the 9/11 "truth movement," and the same arguments apply to most other issues (except of course the specific and fully legitimate issue of U.S. support of Israel).

I cringe to think of how condescending this sounds, but it must be said: antisemitism, like racism, is a very old and well-known social (mental) disease. It is important to understand this because we also need to understand that people like Cockburn and Sunstein are NOT out to combat this disease. Sunstein says so explicitly:

> Our primary claim is that conspiracy theories typically stem not from irrationality or mental illness of any kind but from a "crippled epistemology," in the form of a sharply limited number of (relevant) informational sources. Those who hold conspiracy theories do so because of what they read and hear.

In other words, he is not concerned about sickos; he's worried about *us*. We don't read enough. Or hear enough. And what we do read and hear is wrong. That's why we need government agents to enlighten us – secretly, since otherwise we might get suspicious, given what we have learned about how the government lies to us.

Aside from knowing nothing about the facts in any of the cases he mentions, Sunstein is risibly unaware that the government's tale of 9/11 is the mother of all conspiracy theories, the most outrageous of all: 19 aeronautically-challenged Arabs with box cutters directed by a caveman in Afghanistan bring the U.S. Air Force to its knees four times on one day. If anybody's "epistemology" is crippled, it is Sunstein's.

I would be encouraged, rather than dismayed, if Obama were drawn to people who call for Glasnost – less secrecy, not more, and more disclosure, not more propaganda – but all is not lost. The fact that Sunstein at least pays lip service to the principle of "cognitive diversity," even though for him this just means propagating

---

231 See http://www.democrats.com/node/11798.

232 See http://www.salon.com/news/opinion/glenn_greenwald/2010/01/15/sunstein/index.html.

233 See http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/09/06/van_jones_resigns.html.

234 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Duke.

235 See "9/11, Antisemitism and Denial" and "The 4,000 Jews Forewarned Nonsense Again," in this volume.

the government's point of view, leaves us an opening to exploit. In addition to not using words like *Zionist* and *Jewish*, which we know bring nothing but trouble, there is a whole universe of facts that still need to be spread, and though Obama and Sunstein seem blissfully unaware of it, the odds are in our favor. We will win the infowar.

Propaganda War or Infowar

Feb. 24, 2010

"George Washington"[236] suggests that we use the tools of the enemy, "psychology or marketing techniques," i.e., propaganda, to "promote the truth," and he is quite right to anticipate "ethical reservations," but my reservations are not only ethical but tactical. He is "completely opposed" to using these techniques to spread "disinformation," but what in the world does he think would then enable us to distinguish "good" propaganda from bad?

The answer is of course the very "facts and logic" that he claims are hindering us (when we appeal to them) from reaching the "larger audience" in the first place. In other words, "GW" is suggesting that we join the propaganda war, which will accomplish nothing except to distract those who can and prefer to deal in facts and logic from doing what they do best and what in the end will be the only thing that can defeat the propaganda of the other side (the enemies of truth).

I would hesitate in principle to take any advice from someone whose respect for truth does not even extend to using his real name (yes, it's a he), and in this case the advice is pernicious. Don't follow it. Of course what he and Lakoff and Luntz (and long before them Bernays) say about how we are manipulated is true, but there is nothing new about any of it. More importantly, what "GW" forgets to mention is that in a propaganda war it is not the best man but the biggest man who wins. Sure we can adopt the techniques of Madison Avenue and the mass media – and what makes him think we don't already? – but the significant and decisive point is that we are NOT Madison Avenue and the mass media. We simply do not have the bucks to make our case with anything like the effectiveness that the corporatocracy can and does. We cannot win the propaganda war.

Thus it makes no sense, and is counterproductive, to suggest that we join this war, which would be to fight Goliath on his own terms. Bad analogy, since we have no assurance that our Goliath can or will be defeated, at least any time soon. How long have 99% of humanity been struggling against their oppression by the powerful 1%? What seems to be different now, in fact unique, is the degree of our delusion. Things have changed a lot since 2001, but still today the notion that we (especially Americans) are free and brave (and lots of other nice things) must stand in lurid contrast to the reality that will someday be seen more clearly, if the world survives long enough. I wonder if the Germans of the 1930s thought of themselves as free and brave. Brave maybe, like good soldiers, but free?

The notion that we can use propaganda to fight propaganda seems to me a symptom of this unique state of self-delusion. Worse than that, if I were the Minister of Truth I would promote it as an excellent idea. Oh yes, let's get a few of Crass Sunstein's "corrective information" agents out there fighting fire with fire to keep the truth seekers occupied, so that if and when it becomes necessary we can send in an overwhelming force, a couple of battalions of "correctors," to set things right.

This is not the way to fight. Goliath reigns. The reptilian and mammalian brains have the advantage, as always. But facts and logic are our slingshot. That's all we have. We have a chance to at least hold our own in the information war, especially if we can keep the internet the way it is, and stave off the rapidly increasing and coalescing forces to "monetize" it, which will lead inevitably to less accessibility for the masses and more control for the plutocrats. We just have to find a way to use it effectively. It's a challenge for the hackers, the youthful nerdy herds who by sheer numbers and enthusiasm may find a way to stay ahead of Big Brother and someday, who knows, may find a way to turn something like Facebook into something like a people's revolution.

---

[236] See http://www.opednews.com/articles/1/How-to-Reach-A-Larger-Audi-by-George-Washington-100223-89.html.

Online Sex and Other Dreams

Feb. 26, 2010

This is for all you techies and hackers out there. As I said last time,[237] the fate of the world may be in your hands, and I'm not joking. The fact that you are reading this, perhaps passed on from a progressive friend even though your politics may be quite different from his or hers or mine, or even non-existent, makes my first point. I don't have to tell you, of all people, what an enormously powerful tool the internet is, or that (my second point) there are powerful forces gathering to bring it under the control of Big Brother, in the name of "security" and profitability. I'm not going to link to a bunch of articles to make this clear because I think you know what I mean, but I will add that even "progressive" commentators like Chris Hedges[238] cannot be trusted in this respect. Let's put it this way: the internet is fine and dandy just the way it is. It is developing apace, becoming more and more accessible and attractive to more and more people, and all attempts to control and "monetize" it will stymie that growth and serve the interests of the corporations and the government, not the people. This is an open and shut case of "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." If you don't believe that, just ask yourself if you would be more or less likely to be reading this if the corporations and the government had their way. You have to stay ahead of them, and I think you can, which is why I said the fate of the world is in your hands.

I want to make a couple of other points, one about money and one about sex. Re money, it is highly overrated. Big Bro (the corporations and the government) want it all, of course, and that is a large part of what this is all about. Staying free means keeping their hands out of our pockets. Whenever anybody comes along with big ideas about how to change the internet, just follow the money; it will be going from you to them, and that tells you whose interests are being served. Take the Obama campaign. We have all heard the hype about how that was the first "internet" campaign, and how it was therefore a "democratic" one in which lots of little people gave little bits of money that managed to get the people's hero elected over the corporate stooge. By now we know, however, or should, that this is either a bald-faced lie or a trick, or both, because the people's hero is proving to be just as much a corporate stooge as the other guy. Do you really think Obama would have won just because a lot of little people threw pennies at him? No, he won because the big bucks behind the scenes wanted him to win. Don't ask me to explain it because it's not necessary. We all know it. The world is corrupt, and Mammon rules. That's why we want to change it. (I hope you're with me on that.)

No, Obama was not a democratic revolution. The internet did not elect him. That doesn't mean it can't happen, though. We would be very foolish to take that dog-and-pony show as evidence of the power of the people and the internet. It may be evidence of how Big Bro can use the internet against us, but it has nothing to do with the real power of the internet, which remains untapped. Hence my third point: Money doesn't matter. Never before in history have so many people been empowered with so much ability to communicate with each other as now, and this is not because so many people have become richer. The opposite is the case. On the whole, people have become much poorer, as our pockets are emptied by the plutocrats in Washington and on Wall Street, but we are much richer in our power to communicate with each other. This should be taken as a fundamental lesson in the relationship between wealth and democracy: they are not the same thing, and generally opposites because wealth defined as money is always determined by how much more of it one person has than another, which has nothing to do with democracy.

What we want is democracy, and this cannot be achieved by fighting propaganda with propaganda, because that is fighting wealth with wealth, or in our (the people's) case, with poverty. The big bucks will win every time, Obama being no exception. Get that out of your head, and get your mind on how we can actually do what they falsely tell us Obama did, which is use the internet to change the world, starting with winning elections.

Internet voting, for example. The other day a Facebook friend wrote that internet voting would be a bad thing because then there will be no way to recount or audit the vote counts. I don't know if that's true or not. She forgot, however, that *provided the internet is kept free* (i.e., the way it is now), internet vote fraud could be easily exposed by comparing the results of elections with the results of independent polls, much in the way that exit

---

[237] See previous essay, "Propaganda War or Infowar."

[238] See http://www.alternet.org/story/145683/are_corporations_using_the_internet_to_accelerate_our_cultural%2C_political_and_economic_decline/.

polls can be used to expose electoral fraud now, except that through the internet the polls could be organized and carried out in exactly the same way as the elections themselves, and thus would be equally valid. These "polls" would become referenda, and competing referenda, so that the government-sponsored referenda, which we now call "elections," would become just one of many. The winner or winners of this competition would be the ones who do the best job, namely the job of collecting and counting the opinions of the largest number of people in the fairest and most accurate way. That would be democracy in action. It would be up to the competitors to demonstrate convincingly that their methods and apparatus are better than others, and all of them would most likely be much better than our current electoral system, which is rotten to the core and totally worthless, as our government has very convincingly managed to demonstrate to us (even by Supreme Court edict) in the last few years.

The point I want to make about sex is that it, too, is a hoax, in relation to the internet. It is not possible to have sex online, and it never will be. Nor is it possible to have sex by watching a movie or reading a book, but most of us learn this through experience anyway. More important is the fact that Big Brother will use the basest excuse to undermine our new-found power of the internet, and in addition to "terror," sex is probably the dirtiest trick. No one, or no one who is not criminally insane, would like to see child pornography or snuff films, for example, on the internet. There are plenty of people, though, who may also be criminally insane, who would like to use this as a reason to impose censorship and controls that would go far beyond what is necessary to police criminal activity. This is where you come in. The laws are there. All you have to do is show the cops how to enforce them in cyberspace. It can't be that hard. I just don't believe that it is technically impossible to track down the child pornographers just because they use a complicated server network or originate in foreign countries. The police in fact do a pretty good job of this already. Still, this is what we hear: We must clamp down on the internet to stop the child pornographers and the terrorists! BS. What they really want to do is clamp down on free expression. There is already a huge body of law and precedent to determine the limits of free expression, and they apply to the internet as much as to any other form of publication. This is a law enforcement problem, nothing more. I'm sure the kings and princes would have liked to outlaw the printing press, too, after it was invented, or at least be in control of who had access to one, but they couldn't. They failed. We have to make sure they fail to control the internet, too.

If you have read this far, maybe I can get you to help promote the demonstration in Washington on March 20. The IndictBushNow[239] people are asking for money, too, but that's not necessary. Just get your bod to Washington. I can't go because I live in Germany, but I support it because it is a way to show what the internet can do. Could do. Can the internet get a million bodies to Washington, to send not only Bush and Co. but also Obama and the congresswimps a message? Can Big Bro prevent it? Can corporate big bucks prevent it? They would if they could, we can be sure of that. Furthermore, you might meet somebody nice.

[239] See http://www.impeachbush.org/site/News2/1104841886?page=NewsArticle&id=5421&news_iv_ctrl=1281.

On the March 20 Demonstration in Washington

March 15, 2010

I don't understand why the demonstration planned by IndictBushNow[240] is not being more widely promoted. This is a chance to send an unmistakable message to the wimps in Congress and the White House. Heck, you can even meet other people who are not brain dead! Am I missing something? I am allergic to organizations asking for money, but you don't have to donate. Just go. (Unfortunately, I can't because I live in Germany.) Hitting the streets is just about the only thing that can make a difference, and – so far at least – it's legal.

I don't understand why IndictBushNow.org is not promoting it more, either. Where is the list of speakers and prominent people attending? There should be hordes. This is something tens of millions of Americans support. Something is wrong here. Please give me a clue if you have one.

There was no comment to this, posted on OpEdNews.com, but on March 13 Margaret Bassett [241] wrote a short piece referring, among other things, to having learned (from her standpoint of 88 years of age) "what impeachment is good for," to which I responded:

Greetings, Margaret,

On impeachment and what it's good for, I have to comment, I guess for the third and last time. Every time I am surprised and disappointed again I wonder how it happens, proving I guess that hope springs eternal. But you (or one of your colleagues) did headline this one and it still got zero response. It truly puzzles me. I am actually wondering if that demo on March 20 has been cancelled and I just haven't heard about it and people are just too polite to tell me. Of course Bush and Co. will not be indicted, just as they would not have been impeached, but what is the effort good for? As I said, I was flabbergasted in 2006 to find myself trying (in vain) to explain this to people like Janice Matthews of 911truth.org and Paul Zarembka. How can it not be obvious to anyone with the slightest notion of what "political process" means in a society which is at least trying to be (or become) democratic? My God. We do what we can. We can – still, but who knows for how long – gather in the streets and protest. We can try to get media attention. We can try to impeach. We can try to indict. All of these things are still legal and still (I hope but am seriously beginning to doubt) part of our culture. How can people possibly argue that none of it is "worth trying" because it "won't work," or "even if it worked we'd only get another puppet"? They see no value whatsoever in the political process, in the value of organizing and mobilizing people, of getting them to, as you say, hang together rather than separately.

As I said – and of course I do not mean you or OpEdNews; you at least headlined my little blurb – I just don't believe most people feel that way, and I am frankly suspicious of the people who take this defeatist attitude (for that is exactly what it is). And I do not understand why no one has commented on what I wrote; I really don't. I don't know what to conclude. This is not good. My own disappointment will pass. I can retreat into my cocoon. But it is a very bad sign, I'm afraid. Whether it is really the people who are so destroyed that they have no will to resist, or – as I suspect is more likely – it is the result of Big Brother's media manipulation, it is bad in any case.

I won't say another word about it, lest I break into profanity, but I had to have one more go at it. When we celebrate St. Patrick's Day, let us remember that the Irish struggle for freedom is part of the universal struggle of man to overcome, and to become. And sing those rebel songs. They still apply, though now more in Americay than in old Erin.

On March 15 I posted this:

Websites NOT promoting the March 20 protest in Washington

---

240 See http://www.impeachbush.org/site/News2/1695802962?page=NewsArticle&id=5421&news_iv_ctrl=1281.

241 See http://www.opednews.com/populum/diarypage.php?f=Moody-as-a-Mid-March-Day-by-Margaret-Bassett-100313-630.html.

As I wrote a few days ago, I am astounded at the failure of "alternative" websites to promote or even mention the March 20 protest in Washington. I hasten to pronounce OpEdNews not guilty, since they have at least announced it[242] and even headlined my note for a day – to which there was no response from the readership whatever, which again astounds me.

Also not guilty, and in view of the situation I guess I should say heroic (gulp, if that's what things have come to), are the following, according to a quick survey I did yesterday:

ANSWER Coalition[243] with list of endorsers[244]
U.S. Green Party (Cynthia McKinney et al)[245]
Veterans Today[246]

There are others, but this is just a random sampling of the sites I happened to visit. In that random sampling, however, lies my astonishment, because otherwise I rely on sites like these for real news, as opposed to the Crimestop and Doublethink force-fed pablum we get from the mainstream. Here are the pages where I saw NO MENTION of the March 20 protest in Washington at all, in the random order that they happened to occur to me:

antiwar.com
greenparty.org
libertarianparty.com
911truth.org
commondreams.org
truthout.org
salon.com
rawstory.com
MoveOn.org
UnitedforPeace.org
sagaw.org (Service Academy Graduates Against the War)
CodePinkAlert.org
infowars.com
prisonplanet.com
globalresearch.ca
informationclearinghouse.info
wsws.org

At that point, I stopped and sent an email to Kurt Nimmo of infowars.com, asking him why the Alex Jones org (I think he has literally millions of listeners and readers) was not promoting the March 20 demonstration. I said his answer would be seen (at least accessible) to my ca. 2000 Facebook friends, so he knows it would be public. He wrote back: "If you want to write an article about it, we will post. Unfortunately, I am but one person and do not have time to write about every event."

I answered: "If it takes an article from me to get you to promote such an event, it's a lost cause. You don't have time? Do you really expect anyone to believe that?"

Kurt did not respond to that, not surprisingly. I don't mean to pick on him or infowars.com or Alex Jones, or any of the sites above. I admire and respect the work of all of them. I am just trying to register my astonishment, disappointment, and sincere perplexity at their non-interest in this event.

---

242 See http://www.opednews.com/Events/March-20-March-on-the-Pen-by-OpEdNews-100107-147.html.

243 See https://secure2.convio.net/pep/site/SPageServer?JServSessionIdr004=54txbm9t42.app202a&pagename=ANS_homepage.

244 See http://www.pephost.org/site/PageServer?pagename=M20_endorserslist.

245 At the time of writing it was posted here: http://www.gp.org/index.php.

246 At the time of writing it was posted here: http://www.veteranstoday.com/2010/03/14/military-families-speak-out-against-the-occupation-of-iraq-and-afghanistan-war/.

I'm not a neophyte. I've been around awhile (64, therefore well into Old Fartage for most of you probably), been involved in a lot of protests and demonstrations, so it's not so easy to surprise me, and of course I'm not surprised at all by the lack of mass media coverage. But I am not talking about the mass media here. I am talking about US (you and me), the "alternative" media. I just don't get it. Are people – again I do not mean the sheeple but the people who run, read, and contribute to websites like those above – just too stupid or too demoralized to realize that this is an opportunity to protest against many things, not just the war, not just indicting Bush, not just health care, not just the economy and the bank bailouts, not just 9/11, not just the Patriot Act, not just the McCain-Lieberman Nazi bill,[247] but virtually everything inflicted on us by the previous administration and being continued by the current one?

I just can't get my head around this. So many smart and well-informed people – the "alternative" media folk – and yet somehow they fail to understand the most basic principle of politics, which is mobilizing and organizing people, fail to understand that the most effective way to do this and be heard by the powers-that-be is to hit the streets, and fail to understand or even appreciate the value of this form of protest, public assembly and non-violent mass protest, which for the time being at least is still legal?

I can hear readers saying, if not like Kurt Nimmo that they "don't have time," saying all sorts of things, none of which amount to anything more than irrational excuses for whatever the real problem is, and which I honestly do not understand. No reasonably intelligent progressive person is really going to sit back and say it's not worth protesting because it won't do any good anyway, or isn't focused enough, isn't exactly the way I would like it, I'm too worried about the economy, about losing my house, about the stock market, etc.

So I ask again: What's going on here? I have two choices. Either my opinion of the human race, including the "alternative" (by now very large, according to various polls) portion of the population, goes down another big notch, or something more sinister is going on. I don't know what the latter could be, exactly, but the obvious possibility that comes to mind is that Big Brother has got his hands firmly around the balls of "alternatives" as well as the mainstream. So firmly that the result is this: the "alternatives" can write and publish and youtube whatever they like, but when it comes to hitting the streets, NO! Yeah, it's (still) legal, and yeah, it is (or used to be) a time-honored American tradition, yeah it's our constitutional right (and DUTY!), but NO! Talk is ok, but no bodies (live ones, I mean) in the streets. That is just too effective. Too emotional. Too invigorating. Too inspiring. Too unpredictable. That just might actually get Big Brother and the Inner Party to feel some fear themselves rather than just keep dishing it out to us 24/7 – and this why it is a NO-NO.

Either one of these conclusions would be a sad one. At the moment I see no other alternative.

On March 16 I posted this as a comment to the above:

I first heard about this event in a mailing from IndictBushNow.org, formerly ImpeachBushNow.org, Ramsey Clark's organization. Now I notice that these two orgs, which I thought were organizing the thing, are not even listed on ANSWER's list of endorsers (although Ramsey Clark is).

I had to search to find a mention (among many other events) of March 20 on the United for Peace and Justice site.[248] It is certainly not on the homepage, and this is hardly what I would call promoting it, but much more like not promoting it.

Later the same day (March 16) I posted a second comment:

I have already reported on my letter to infowars.com. I have just sent the following to the other websites, and will report their response, or (more likely) non-response:

> Why are you not promoting the demonstration on Sat. March 20, 2010 on your website?
>
> Please read and respond to the following, preferably as a comment to the article at OpEdNews.com: "Websites NOT promoting the March 20 protest in Washington."

---

[247] See http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/03/a-detention-bill-you-ought-to-read-more-carefully/37116.

[248] See http://www.unitedforpeace.org/index.php.

I will make public your response, or non-response. People have a right to know why you are not promoting this event.

The recipients are:

rgingras@salon.com
matt@antiwar.com
info@greenparty.org
pr@lp.org
press@911truth.org
editor@commondreams.org
editor@rawstory.com
editor@moveon.org
editor@truthout.org
membergroups@unitedforpeace.org
sagaw@sagaw.org
info@codepinkalert.org
crgeditor@yahoo.com
tom@informationclearinghouse.info
info@wsws.org
info@moveon.org
info@truthout.org

How to Quash a March: Chris Hedges Is Wrong

March 20, 2010

As I have been saying, the demonstration in Washington today seems to have been systematically undermined by "progressive" websites (by non-promotion) and has lost all focus. Today I read on OpEdNews[249] that "hundreds of civic organizations and activists are heading to the nation's capital to demand (from) the White House and Congress the passage of an immigration reform that would allow millions to regularize their legal status."

Huh?

On the ANSWER homepage[250] we find nary a mention of what I thought was the original purpose of the march, which I heard about in a direct mailing from IndictBushNow[251] "to denounce Bush-era criminal wars." That would have been quite enough, especially since that issue segues seamlessly into the larger War on Terror, and also into the current Administration's shameless continuation of that phony war.

Now that goal has been subordinated, and in fact erased, in favor of other issues, namely the "siege of Palestine," the plight of "the people of Haiti" and "the people of Honduras," the extradition of Luis Posada, the ending of the blockade of Cuba, and the aforesaid immigration reform. There are, it is true, two colorful banners saying "U.S. Out of Afghanistan and Iraq Now!" but they link to nowhere, i.e., to a page that is identical to the ANSWER homepage!

There is no mention of the lies that brought us the wars, no mention of the Mother of All Lies, 9/11, no mention of "preemptive warfare" or the subversion of the Constitution, no mention of the Patriot Acts, Military Commissions Acts, Guantánamo, Abu Ghraib, rendition, torture (except in reference to an FOIA request in a specific case), or election fraud. There is no mention of the bank bailouts or Wall Street thievery, and you have to read the fine print to find any mention of healthcare: "Students facing tuition hikes and cutbacks, workers who have been laid-off from their jobs, people without health care and facing foreclosure or eviction, or others feeling the domestic impact of the war are bringing some visual representation of their struggles."

Now, I have a great deal of sympathy with all of these causes, but they are not the central issue and EVERYBODY KNOWS IT – except, apparently, the organizers of the march. The central issue is that our government has been "hijacked by a criminal cabal intent on using the hard-earned dollars of the American people for war, occupation, and empire," as Cynthia McKinney[252] put it succinctly at a recent peace rally in Munich.

If Cynthia McKinney, and millions of other Americans, have no trouble putting it that way, why couldn't the organizers of the rally today in Washington do so?

Before you answer that question, here's another one. Why does Chris Hedges,[253] the son of a preacher and a product of Harvard Divinity School, tell us it's all over but the praying? That's his message: Don't fight back because it's too dangerous and futile, but keep praying and protesting anyway. We need to keep our spirits alive, "if not for ourselves, then at least for those who follow." For Hedges, "this is the only victory possible."

Gimme a friggin break. Maybe that's what they teach people at the Harvard Divinity School, but it's a far cry from the David Ray Griffin school of theology, as elaborated in *Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11* (2006), a book which taught me something that frankly had never occurred to me before – that Jesus was an anti-imperialist revolutionary! I strongly recommend this book to Hedges and also to the numerous readers who commented on his article and found it so consonant with their own views, and thus, I suspect, so *comforting*. Ah yes, what a pleasure it is to learn from such an eloquent man how futile it is to fight against oppression, to know there is nothing we can do but try to salve our consciences with "tiny acts" of defiance while the world crumbles around us.

This is not the lesson that Jesus taught, nor is it the message of David Griffin or Cynthia McKinney or, to take someone Hedges admires as much as we probably all do, Noam Chomsky. Neither Hedges nor Chomsky

---

249 See http://www.opednews.com/articles/Sheriff-Joe-Arpaio-challen-by-Eduardo-Barraza-100319-221.html.

250 See https://secure2.convio.net/pep/site/SPageServer?JServSessionIdr004=knnzr0agb4.app213b&pagename=ANS_homepage.

251 See http://www.impeachbush.org/site/News2/1695802962?page=NewsArticle&id=5421&news_iv_ctrl=1281.

252 See http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/node/50035.

253 See http://www.opednews.com/articles/We-Stand-on-the-Cusp-of-on-by-Chris-Hedges-100318-294.html.

questions the official story of 9/11, so neither one of them really quite gets it, but Chomsky is a fighter, and compared to Hedges, a raving optimist. Chomsky thinks we can do what the Bolivians did, and that we can start just by reclaiming our own Constitution – which by now has become a revolutionary concept. None of us are advocating violence. Where did Hedges get this? From Glenn Beck?

Big Bro would like nothing better than for us to think there is nothing we can do to realistically oppose "the psychopathic forces in control of our power systems" except offer "often imperceptible acts of defiance."

Hedges doesn't like the way the internet is now, either. It's too free. He calls it "the Information Super-Sewer"[254] taken over "by corporate interests to accelerate our cultural, political and economic decline." And the way to fix it is to monetize it, to make people pay for everything they get. That will further "creativity." Cheezus friggin crispies.

I'll tell you what it looks like to me. It looks like Big Brother has Chris Hedges by the balls. Give up the free internet, don't fight back because we're helpless, and keep on a-praying and a-protesting because it will make us feel better. (Always good to let off a little steam.) That is Chris Hedges' message, and I can't for the life of me see how Crass Sunstein could say it better.

I'll tell you something else. It looks to me like Big Brother also has the "progressive" organizations by the balls. He knows how to infiltrate activist and progressive groups and steer them into relatively harmless directions – without the majority of the people in those organizations having a clue. He knows that when they tell us "March on Washington for Palestine" instead of "March on Washington to indict Bush, end the phony war on terror, etc.," they might as well be telling us NOT to march on Washington, for all the impact it will have. He knows that with the help of the internet there could easily be not tens of thousands but *millions* of Americans at the barricades, and he knows that this must be avoided at all costs because it would mean real trouble for him and the Inner Party.

Big Brother, unlike Chris Hedges, knows that we can and must fight back, with peaceful and legal means, if we want democracy, that we can do it by organizing and demonstrating, and that the internet will help us do it, but he also knows that we cannot and will not do it as long as he, Big Bro, determines the agenda and keeps us convinced of our helplessness.

---

254 See http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/the_information_super-sewer_20100214/.

The Alchemy of Antisemitism

March 25, 2010

Alan Sabrosky's recent and much-trumpeted statement that "Israel did 9/11"[255] is highly irrational and fuels, I suspect on purpose, the antisemitism that already plagues and undermines the "truth movement."

His "argument,"[256] such as it is, is easily debunked. It combines sense with nonsense, and it is very easy to distinguish the two, unless you are antisemitic, but that is precisely the problem.

Sensibly, Sabrovsky says:

> Several things are very clear to me from a careful assessment of both official and critical evaluations of the 9/11 attacks. First, the striking aircraft alone simply could not have brought down either of the two buildings in the manner in which they fell, much less a third building which was not hit by a plane (I expect the one intended to do that as a "cover" had ended up in that Pennsylvania field), given the available physical evidence and a wealth of expert testimony. This means the attackers had assistance on the ground, and it had to have been active before the attacks occurred: preparing buildings for controlled demolition is not something done haphazardly in the midst of chaos.

Few people who have looked at the evidence closely would disagree with this. He continues:

> Second, only two intelligence agencies had the expertise, assets, access and political protection to execute 9/11 in the air and on the ground: our CIA...

Many would also readily agree about the CIA, and it is indeed significant when a man with his military credentials confirms the obvious, but this is only the bait. Now comes the switch:

> ... and Israel's Mossad. Only one had the incentive, using the "who benefits" principle: Mossad. And that incentive dovetailed perfectly with the neo-con's agenda and explicitly expressed need for a catalytic event to mobilize the American public for their wars, using American military power to destroy Israel's enemies. Only the unexpected strength of the Iraqi resistance kept Syria and Iran from being attacked in the second Bush Administration. Thus, the evidential trail for 9/11 and the wars in Afghanistan & Iraq run from PNAC, AIPAC and their cohorts; through the mostly Jewish neo-cons in the Bush Administration; and back to the Israeli government. None of the denials and political machinations can alter that essential reality. Terms such as treason, betrayal and deceit do not overstate the case against them.

This is utter nonsense. Sabrosky, like a good Marine, is telling us that the CIA had no incentive to implement "the neo-con's [neo-cons'] agenda and explicitly expressed need for a catalytic event to mobilize the American public for their wars," because – according to Sabrosky – the purpose of these wars is "to destroy Israel's enemies." The U.S. has no interest in oil or gas or in military dominance of the Middle East! We're just there to help out the Israelis!

I believe this is what the CIA would call a limited hangout. You admit a relatively (and somewhat defensible) truth, that we are Israel's friend, and then you blame everything else on Israel, which is a lie. They can take it. They are used to being blamed, and probably know this is the price they have to pay for our friendship. They're the bad guys anyway – for other, legitimate reasons – and in the end, blaming them for the wrong thing (9/11) is an excellent way to get them off the hook on all counts.

1) It distracts attention away from the real crimes of the Israeli government (the siege of Palestine).

2) It distracts attention from the "other" – and in fact ONLY – intelligence agency that could have done 9/11: the CIA.

3) It feeds antisemitism, which in turn can be forcefully denounced and used to reinforce 1) and 2).

---

[255] E.g., http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article25028.htm.

[256] See http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article23460.htm.

It should be clear that Sabrosky, with his intimate military connections, would never have been allowed to make the statements he has made without these strategic goals having been carefully considered. Consider what the effect would be if, in contrast, he had followed through with the much more logical argument that since the CIA is more powerful than the Mossad it would be foolish to assert that the Mossad tells the CIA what to do rather than vice versa. Suppose Sabrosky had used his military expertise and inside knowledge to explain to us in more detail his statement that the CIA has "the expertise, assets, access and political protection to execute 9/11 in the air and on the ground." Surely he has more knowledge of that than he does about the Mossad.

Needless to say, this won't happen. Sabrosky has accomplished his mission. The antisemites, along with the deniers, are already frothing with delight at having their faith restored in Uncle Sam. I suspect he will receive a military commendation or a medal from the CIA.

Noam Rocks On

April 14, 2010

Re Noam Chomsky's lecture "A World Of Freedom And Justice"[257] on April 8 in Madison:

And remember that I'm the guy that (as few know) put Chomsky through the wringer more than most people (in fact anyone as far as I know) have managed to do.[258] He mentions everything in this video, including the point about JFK (the Vietnam withdrawal plan) that I went toe-to-toe (and tooth and nail) with him on some years ago. I still think I won that argument, and I also disagree with him about 9/11, but here's the point and it's a big one: I STILL LOVE HIM!

I hope this inspires the wag that called me a "fag Jew" on Facebook the other day because I expressed a lack of appreciation for David Icke and because I insist on seeing the U.S. government as responsible for the actions and policies of the U.S. government (rather than "Jews," "Zionists," Israel, the Mossad, Bilderbergers, Illuminati, secret international banking cartels, etc.) to repeat the compliment, because although I am neither homosexual nor Jewish, such idiocy can only be understood as confirmation that one is on the right track.

Chomsky and I ended our correspondence in mutual name-calling, but – especially after my experience with the World Socialist Website (at least with the recently created representation thereof on Facebook[259]) – I want to make my position clear and perhaps set an example for others who may have similar experiences. Unlike the dogmatists who like to claim "socialism," however they might define it, or any other -ism (or body of thought, even individual arguments) as their own, rejecting and alienating anyone that does not accept their views in toto – an attitude which goes beyond dogma to fascism – I believe that compromise is necessary, inevitable, and need not entail abandonment of one's principles. It is inherent in the very notion of democratic politics – though not, apparently, if the WSWS supporters barking at me recently are any example, of "socialism."[260]

You will find me behind the barricades with Noam Chomsky. Please tell him if you see him. I'd tell him myself, but I am trying to outgrow my need for heroes and I don't trust myself to express what I feel adequately. It wouldn't be much different in substance from what I would say to a lot of people these days (Cynthia McKinney, Ralph Nader, Michael Moore, Dennis Kucinich, Ron Paul, Paul Craig Roberts, Alex Jones, Jesse Ventura, etc.): "I agree with you on a lot of things, but not everything. Let's try to work together." (What I learned from the WSWS cohort, Facebook version anyway, is that neither I nor Chomsky nor any of the others mentioned can work with them.) Emotionally, though, since I have invested a lot more time and energy in Chomsky (both as a linguist and political observer) than in the others, it might be hard to get it right. I would not want to risk offending him again – or punishing myself on the rebound. So better to leave it at this, and hope the message gets through.

---

257 See http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article25209.htm.

258 See "Chomsky and Newman – The False Debate," in this volume.

259 See http://www.facebook.com/wsws.org?ref=ts.

260 See http://www.facebook.com/note.php?note_id=387620828415 and http://www.facebook.com/topic.php?uid=323792034683&topic=13568.

Progressive Summit

April 17, 2010

In various comments I have posted recently I have suggested a summit meeting of a broad range of progressive leaders to decide on points of agreement and action, a sort of counter-Tea Party, if you will. Of course such a coalition will be opposed tooth and nail by the Establishment, including all the major parties and the mass media. This is because it would represent, if it could be brought into being, a much larger portion of the population than the Tea Party. Just look at the Fan pages on Facebook of the people I list below. This is just a beginning. Please add to the list. There are many more.

Of course I am for Rob Kall's[261] Bottom Up or grass roots philosophy, but I think our "leaders," meaning the various people we support, have a duty to DEMONSTRATE to us how it is possible to get together and agree on specific political goals despite their differences, and act accordingly. The Bottom Up part would consist of us putting enough pressure on whichever of these leaders we support to do this.

The goal that I would suggest as a beginning is the immediate and total withdrawal of all troops from the Middle East. Once even one major goal like this has become clarified, it will snowball and other common goals will appear. Call it a "Progressive Coalition" or something like that. If this cannot be done, I see no way out of what Paul Craig Roberts and others are predicting, which is either economic chaos and devastation due to collapse of the dollar, or the continuation of U.S. imperial militarism, war with Iran, and very likely nuclear war following that.

Here is the beginning of the list of people I am thinking about, in random order (as they come to my mind): Noam Chomsky, Paul Craig Roberts, Michael Moore, Dennis Kucinich, Ron Paul, Cynthia McKinney, Alex Jones, Gerald Celente, David Ray Griffin, Cindy Sheehan, Ramsey Clark, Alex Cockburn ... There are many, many more, and I am purposely including people here (e.g., Alex Cockburn, Chomsky) that I have attacked in the past (mainly for their antipathy to what they call "conspiracy theory") to demonstrate the principle.

I don't want to call it the principle of "compromise" because that has negative connotations. "Coalition" or "alliance" would be better because the principle is in fact that we do NOT "compromise" our different beliefs in our willingness to band together for specific political purposes. This should be elementary in democratic politics, but the idea seems to get lost easily – not the least because, as I said, the Establishment will do everything in their power to prevent it from happening. Nevertheless, if we can make it happen, it will be the peaceful revolution we all want.

---

[261] Rob Kall is the founder of OpEdNews.com.

Poems

1987-2009

Schoolyard

1987

through the wire mesh at night
the schoolyard domed in yellow light
smooth and empty no-man's-land
like the inside of a peach can

the old block left to lurch
shut up tighter than a church
through darkened eyes we hardly see
inside the flags and maps of country

once as children, fond of yarns
father's land and mother's arms
we learned our lessons, by the book
of chinks in armor, gobbledygook

till the bell rang, and we heard her
each one screaming bloody murder
free for all, we came to blows
over hopskotch and dominoes

now that concrete slab
packed over worms and blab
dirty words unseeming
childish poems without meaning
engraved with names of love and war
is still, but will crack once more

Homage à Lawrence Durrell

1987

Here's a ditty
To a smitty

Teller, tinker
Indian inkler

Irish genie
English meany

Ice in a hot wind.
Nile and blue Algonquin

Sing in Greek to Aphrodite
Potawatomi to me.

Muezzin, give an Indo-European hoot
Lo, the alphabet's back in my soup.

(I think of Mnemidis, who ate letters,
Swallowed a watch, and knifed his betters.)

Hail fuller, swager, maker of new
May your pound resound and your bang ring true.

May your words be mine, or for the dustbin,
Laughing-stock, Love's husband.

Jingo Bells

June 16, 1991

Dashing through the sand
For oil we gladly slay
While George our King so bland
Goes laughing all the way

Bombs on Baghdad bring
Genocide and blight
Oh what fun it is to sing
A slaying song tonight

Jingo bells, jingo bells
Jingo all the way
Oh what fun it is to kill
Thousands in one day

April Glaspie knows
That war was George's plan
To make them dollars flow
Just like in Vietnam

George makes war and bucks
For the upper ten per cent
The papers dutifully content
To call it "costs" and luck

Congress sells us out
That's their contribution
They've lost all their clout
Forget the Constitution

Forget the dead and maimed
The bombs and guns and mortar
None of them have died in vain
But for Georgie's New World Order!

The President Malevolent

June 20, 1991

There once was a president malevolent
Who took the law of the country as affrontery.
So he said to his henchmen,
"Don't be back-benchmen,
Get into drugs and gun-runnery.

"It may seem a bit crummy
In this way to make money
To stir up the rabble
And flood 'em with babble
While they sit there and say, 'Ain't it funny.'

"But to hell with democracy.
It's just old-fashioned hypocrisy.
The world is OUR oyster
And there's not enough moisture
To feed all those blithering sops you see.

"We knock off the hard 'uns
The John F.'s and Bobbys and Martins
Send the young 'uns to jail
The dumb 'uns to Yale
And some to California with pardons.

"We've got wars and AIDS to get rid of the scum
Whores and parades to satisfy some
While the boys at Harvard
Talk starboard and larboard
Having fun keeping mum and the shit in the bum.

"The truth, in fact, is plain to see
That's the problem with democracy.
So thank God for Dan Rather
And all of that blather
On the news every night on TV."

Jackie

1994

O you died so suddenly
we'll never know
what sealed your lips,
if it was fear, or pride
or just indifference.

Will you tell us now
ex post facto, posthumous express
who deed the dirty did
and why,
as if we didn't know?

I've always fancied you
especially these past few years,
having seen you in the movies
in pink and pillbox, wisp of hair
waved deftly aside by a gloved hand.

Come to my slum, we'll speak French,
and you will tell me what it's like
to know and not to say,
to have no language
or love outside the family
or class, only conviction?

But are you, sweet heart,
so convinced, even now,
that silence and the gilded cage
are beautiful? Are you,
after all, one of us?

Jason

1994

"It don't make a goddam bit of difference," Jason says,
hunched forward, elbows on his knees,
staring out my attic window
where I survive.

But what is he waiting for
if not for me?

His speckled flesh, once abundant
(you couldn't tell he lifted weights)
droops on his bones.

He's smaller and his face is lined
like jungle trails, leading nowhere,
a map with no names,
a story with no end.

His hair, longer now,
hangs over the collar of his field jacket,
no longer flaming, burning darker
like a sun that won't go down.

I watch his back
and he watches mine.

Butcher Shop

March 13, 1995

Vince says I was courageous to avoid that butcher shop.
Which makes me as courageous as Bill Clinton,
Dan Quayle, and 60% of the rest of my generation.

Bob says he was a fool to go to war,
and Tim O'Brien (in The Things They Carried)
even says he was a coward.

Well thanks, fellows, but no thanks.
I may be a coward, but I won't be a liar and a hypocrite.

They were brave.
I was not.

Bravery is when the man says,
"Put your ass here, no matter what,"
and you put it there.

They thought it was right, and so they went.
That took guts.
I wouldn't take that from them, even if I could.
No, I salute them, especially the ones like Bob
and Ron Kovics and Oliver Stone and the VVAW
who first said yes, and then said no
and thus were two times brave.
I'll turn out for their parade, anytime.

I thought it was wrong, so I didn't go.
That wasn't guts.
I would have gone to Canada, but I lied at the physical
and lucked out, then lucked out again on the lottery,
the same one the President lucked out on.
Was that guts?

I checked a few wrong boxes on the questionnaire
and got in to see the shrink. I didn't think I had a chance,
any more than I'd had to pass the CO test.
"Tell me about your mother," the shrink said.
I couldn't believe it. I'd read some Freud, too.
"Well, she's very attractive..." I began,
and looked distraught, which wasn't hard at all.
I had a beard then, too, which might have helped.
Or maybe he just wanted to give me a break.

Then I found a civilian shrink to confirm the diagnosis –
"Schizoid blah blah blah" – meaning the war was crazier than I was.
A "mass neurosis," the doctor called it.
A great understatement, I thought.

Smart? Naw, not hardly.
The smart ones, like Bill and Dan, played their cards better
and made it to the White House, where they can fight their wars
in comfort, with no blood, no pain,
and no guilt. After all, the people elected them.

I was just lucky.

Now about stupidity.
Bob says it was a stupid war
and how could they have been so stupid?
That was my question, too, a long time ago
and then I buried it, because there was no answer.

I could believe that Johnson was a stupid man (not true)
and that Nixon was just plain depraved (true)
and that my countrymen were patriots
because that's how we were brought up.

But what about those Harvard guys –
the Bundies, the Rostows, the Kissingers,
the best and the brightest, the Whiz Kids?
I knew I wasn't smarter than they were.
I couldn't even get into Harvard.

But any child could see it.
The national security at stake in Vietnam?
Not even close.
"Saving face," they called it, in the end
and more tens of thousands died
conquering nothing, defending nothing,
least of all us, or freedom and democracy
under slimeball dictators named Ngo and Ky and Thieu
whose names were as unspeakable as they were.

"Hell Ngo, we won't go!" was my only answer then.
I could never get my mouth around the other stuff, like
"Hey, hey, LBJ, how many kids did you kill today!"
Weren't we all Americans, somewhere down the line?
How could our own government be the enemy?
Absurd.

But how could they be so stupid, when they weren't?

An unnecessary war, and they refused to stop.
What could be more stupid, or immoral?
Then, as Bob says, they added stupidity to stupidity
and didn't fight it properly.

How could they be so stupid?

There was no answer, so I stopped asking.
Then finally it ended, and the historical consensus grew
like grass over the graves: "A well-intentioned error.
Uncle Sam is innocent, Uncle MacGeorge and Uncle Henry
and all the other uncles, on the grounds of stupidity.
They didn't know the war would cost so much –
$570 billion, accounting for inflation,
and all those lives. How tragic."

But my question was never answered.

Until I saw Jack's head snap back
and all that blood come out of my TV set.

I knew then, because I was hit
and nothing hits that hard but the truth.
I couldn't prove it, but I didn't have to.
I was my own Exhibit A.
Later, when I read about JFK's withdrawal plan,
my mind caught up with my gut
and I knew where all the blood was coming from.

It was the blood of my dead brothers.
They had found me.
I felt their pain, which was much greater than my pain,
and their anger, which was much greater than my anger.
I had become a conduit, having tapped somehow a giant reservoir
of blood and bile deep in the bowels of the earth.
I felt like a volcano, watching itself erupt.

I knew it was them because they found me,
not the other way around. I wasn't even looking.
I was sound asleep. Never had the slightest curiosity,
never read a single book or article about the assassination,
knew nothing of the evidence, never connected it with the war.
I was a victim, too.
They lost their lives, and I lost my mind,
like Rip Van Winkle, for a quarter of a century.

But I'm back now, motherfuckers.
I know the answer to the question.
It took me 25 years to figure it out
but now I know.

It's the wrong question.

They weren't stupid.
They were lying.

Inside Job

June 2006

1.
The somnambular peregrinations that we like to call the life of the mind
are seldom interrupted by ideas.

Still, it happens.

A butterfly flaps its wings in Java, causing an earthquake in the mind.

A bug awakens in some dell of memory and becomes a colossus,
straddling the continental lobes.

The faintest whistle, growing unheard like the corn,
suddenly house-high, bursts like a banshee out of the blue-blown sky
and finds us standing in the tracks.

2.
Why weren't the windows closed on Elm Street?
How can a bullet do gymnastics?
How could a caveman beat
a multi-billion-dollar air force?

How could those buildings fall straight down?

We think inside our minds how it could be
that so many could die so strangely
until one tells us, screaming to deaf ears
"We didn't die. You did."

What are we but ghosts, waiting to be born?

Two Views of Reality

Sept. 1, 2006

Morgan says the government is in the hands of outlaws
and we know who they are.
Kyle says the government is in the hands of outlaws
and we don't know who they are.

Morgan says, "Come out of the White House with your hands up."

Kyle says, "The reality is far more complex
within the gargantuan, byzantine government
and global military-industrial-intelligence complex
and more complex still given the huge power of drug, banking, illicit weapons and other criminal cartels
and the fact that U.S. officials may have acted the part
of guilty parties in some cases to cover-up their own
incompetence or criminal negligence even as they were
aware the official story didn't hold any water."

Ken says, "The answer is both/and.
The Bush administration did do 9/11, but it is also true
that many other people were involved."

I agree with Morgan
partly because I am an optimist
and say, "Impeach Bush, because we can
and can't get to Byzantium
before the rough beast's hour has come."

Nathanael says it must be done forthwith.
Gerard says it's an insult to his intelligence.
Dick says it was Zionist billioniares.
Rosalee says, "Just because it's nonsense
doesn't mean it isn't true."

In the midst of such determination
clarity of mind, and solidarity
what is there to do but wait and die
and hope both beauty and the beast
will pass us by.

Note: The quotes are from an email correspondence with (among others), Morgan Reynolds, Kyle Hence, Ken Jenkins, Rosalee Grable, Gerard Holmgren, and Dick Eastman, except for "Come Out of the White House with your Hands Up," which was the title of Kevin Barrett's review of Reynold's speech at the Univ. of Wisconsin on May 6, 2006. For "Byzantium" and the "rough beast" see Yeats' "Sailing to Byzantium" and "The Second Coming."

Noam

Aug. 23, 2006

For Richard McGinn

I thought I knew what to do with my anger
and that was to stuff it.

Let him lie. He has a family to protect.
Who am I to judge?

But it keeps coming back,
a little piece of shit that won't go down.

"My friend John Deutch."
"No evidence of high-level conspiracy."

Why can't he just keep his mouth shut?
Let's talk about Minimalism.

Then he can convince me of how smart he is
and how dumb I am

but not like this.
He is not an idiot. It just can't be.

But then he is lying.
And.

Let it lie, I say again.
I know this is right.

They can kill him.
They can break his daughter's kneecaps.

They can destroy him in a thousand ways.
They wouldn't hesitate. They've got it planned.

All he's got to do is say the wrong thing, or the right thing,
and he's gone.

Gone the way of millions. That's how high the stakes are.
That's the investment, they will say.

It would be insane, a sacrilege, in fact, to stop now.
Still, there it is.

That little piece of shit that won't go down.
"If only there was some evidence..."

I flush and flush. It stays.

What do I have to do, eat it?

Wait till it dissolves?
Even if it does, it will still have been there

even when we're not.
What a legacy.

Jesus Was a Revolutionary

Sept. 17, 2006

For David Ray Griffin

I had never looked at it that way.
Jesus not Christ but the man.
The fight is far from over.
The emperor, naked as a jaybird, still rides our wizened hearts
and laughs. We know we will be next
at Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo, or right here in god's country
covered with our own excrement and suffocated
underneath some sergeant's ass
unless we fight. But still we say,
the emperor is good. One nation, under emperor, with liberty and justice
and most of everything for just a few.
Caveat preemptor warfare,
mighty rigger of elections, building bomber, anthrax mailman,
liar, executioner, pox americano.
It takes a while to come the second time, but we'll get there.
Introibo ad altar Dei.
Gimme the bread, I 'll give it to the people,
in Jesus' name we pray.
Make love not war, the Virgin said and meant
Fuck ye. Do it in the streets.
Put your AIDS back in the test tube where it came from.
Make us happen before it does to us.
The next holocaust may be the last.

Hugo Chavez

Sept. 21, 2006

On his address to the UN, Sept. 20, 2006[262]

Your words bring solace to a damaged nation
not yours, but mine, a limping giant
wounded in its soul by its very leaders,
the men you call imperialists and devils, assassins, torturers.
We know this too. But we need to hear it from you
because we know you are our friend.
You call us brothers, and we believe you.
You remind us of the well-documented crimes of the CIA
against your country and many others, including our own.
You know Bushco, the devil, was behind 9/11
and all that has followed, and you aren't afraid to say so.
Chomsky doesn't go that far, but David Griffin does
and he agrees with you about the devil.
So do we. We the people
sinking into fascism like the Germans yesterday,
having learned nothing at all from history,
struck deaf, dumb and blind not by 9/11
but by television and the *New York Times*
who sold out to the devil years ago.
Now you come, Hugo Chavez, saying what the *Times*
will not print, but our hearts burn to say
before the UN General Assembly.
How can we thank you but in small ways, like this
in the hope that someday small voices will rise into a chorus
as they have in your country, and in Bolivia
and we one day will have real elections again
and elect people like you who will tell the truth
and do what we want them to do
instead of what they want, which is to enslave us,
kill us, impoverish and exploit us, and worst of all,
do all of this without us knowing, thinking we are free,

---

[262] See http://www.counterpunch.com/chavez09202006.html.

the "greatest country in the world."
Has there ever been a more pitiable state in all of history?
"And they thought they were free!"
will be our epitaph, signed by the Vice-President of Sneers,
unless we rise, hermano, and smile your smile of brotherhood
and justice. Te saludo, Hugo, amigo americano.

Hugo Chávez

Sept. 23, 2006

Translated by "Artemis3" and posted on IndyMedia

En su discurso ante la ONU, 20 de septiembre de 2006
Tus palabras traen consuelo a una nación dañada
no la tuya, sinó la mía, un gigante que cojea
herido en su alma por sus propios líderes,
los hombres que llamas imperialistas y diablos, asesinos, torturadores.
Sabemos eso también. Pero necesitamos oirlo de ti.
porque sabemos que eres nuestro amigo.
Nos llamas hermanos, y te creemos.
Nos recuerdas de los bien-documentados crímenes de la CIA
en contra de tu país y muchos otros, incluyendo el nuestro.
Sabes que Bushco, el diablo, estuvo detrás del 11/9
y de todo lo que le siguió, y no tienes temor de decirlo.
Chomsky no llega tan lejos, pero David Griffin si
y el está de acuerdo contigo sobre el diablo.
Así como nosotros. Nosotros el pueblo
hundiendonos en el fascismo como los Alemanes de ayer,
habiendo aprendido nada nada de la historia,
sordos, mudos y ciegos del impacto no por el 11/9
sino por la televisión y el *New York Times*
que nos vendió al diablo años atrás.
Ahora tu vienes, Hugo Chávez, diciendo lo que el *Times*
no publicará, pero que nuestros corazones arden por decir
ante la Asamblea General de NU.
Como podemos agradecerte sino de pequeñas maneras, como esta
en la esperanza de que algun dia pequeñas voces se levantarán como un coro
como lo han hecho en tu país, y en Bolivia
y nosotros algún día tendremos elecciones reales otra vez
y elegiremos gente como tu que nos dirá la verdad
y harán lo que nosotros queremos que hagan
en lugar de lo que ellos quieren, que es esclavizarnos,
matarnos, empobrecernos y explotarnos, y lo peor de todo,
hacer todo esto sin nosotros saberlo, pensando que somos libres,
la "mas grandiosa nación de la tierra".

¿Ha existido alguna vez un estado mas lamentable en toda la historia?
"¡Y ellos pensaron que eran libres!"
sera nuestro epitafio, firmado por el Vice-Presidente de Burlas,
a menos que nos levantemos, hermano, y sonriamos tu sonrisa de hermandad
y justicia. Te saludo, Hugo, amigo americano.

On the Way to the Gas Chamber

Oct. 7, 2006

On the way to the gas chamber,
the Congress of Cowards lying down for Patriot Acts 1 and 2,
the Electronic Surveillance Modernization Act,
and now the Military Commissions Act of 2006,
trashing the U.S. Constitution, the Geneva Conventions, the UN Charter,
the Nuremberg Principles, and all sense of decency, morality,
reason, and concern for civilization and the perpetuation of the human race,
I draft a little statement, as modest as can be,
considering the circumstances, and ask the "9/11 truth" researchers –
there are thousands of them, hundreds of websites,
polls showing more than a hundred million Americans agree
in contradistinction to the mainlining government-addicted corporate-fed media –

I ask them, can we please stop bickering about planes or no planes
or whether it was the Illuminati, the Bilderbergers, Zionist billionaires,
the Freemasons, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission,
the High Cabal, the military-industrial-complex, or the CIA behind it all
and just get the damned Bushcons out of office, so we can breathe again?

Can we just say this one thing, with one voice, loudly, together, while we still can,
before the brownshirts start marching in the streets, before they start sending us
to the FEMA prison camps they're building, and throw away the key and kill us
as "enemy combatants" and "terrorist suspects," which they now can do
under the new law of the land of the United Police States of America?
Can we please just do this, while we still can, while we still have the internet,
talk radio, and the right to assemble and talk to each other, and once in a blue moon
a program on C-Span, or even the fleeting disdainful attention of O'Reilly or Hannity & Colmes?

The Germans had none of this in 1933, when their own parliament lay down and died
without a fight. The thugs were already marching, breaking bones and windows,
leaving no wriggle room. We're not there yet, but not far away, and when that day comes,
my fellow "researchers," you will drown in tears of shame for having failed to understand
that in times like these, as always, l'unité fait la force, and that alone you are nothing
and worse than nothing because you betray us all, waiting for your private revolution
that will never come, and that you'll miss, even if it does, due to your unfortunate
death, and very likely the nuclear incineration of the rest of us, or the slower agony
of starvation and disease by enivironmental holocaust, inside or outside of a FEMA gulag.

"Oh, I'm so sorry," you will say. "I just didn't think it was a partisan issue.
"After all, the Democrats were in on it too, weren't they? They were all in on it, weren't they?
"I wanted real change, not just a change of puppets."

"No!" you say – now, when you can still talk – "I won't sign on to *this*:"

> It has become abundantly clear to a majority of the American people, not to mention the rest of the world, that the Bush administration has utterly failed to conduct a satisfactory investigation into the events of 9/11. There has been no satisfactory explanation for the failure of our air defenses on that day, and the suspicion that the government itself was complicit in the attacks is widespread and growing rapidly. Since the 9/11 attacks

> have been used by the Bush administration to justify its so-called "war on terror" at home and abroad, causing the loss of fundamental civil liberties as well as tens of thousands of lives, the failure to properly investigate those attacks is inexcusable and intolerable. We are bitterly disappointed and equally outraged by the failure of the mainstream media and Congress to demand action by the executive branch befitting of a democratic government.
>
> We therefore plead, with the utmost urgency, that the American people do everything possible to elect people in the coming elections who will stand up to those in power, defend our right to know the full truth about the events of Sept. 11, 2001, and restore peace and our constitutional rights.

"Oh, no!" says one. " The only statement I'll sign is: They didn't really use planes on 911."

"Oh no!" another no-planer says. "This list insults my intelligence. Take me off it.
"They are all in on it. I won't agree to any such statement and I will attack it and ridicule it wherever it pops up."

Another one instructs me: "Find out the difference between a democracy and a republic.
"Leave me out of your infantile fantasies."

A plane-hugger says, "I don't want to be on this discussion list. Please remove me from it."

But most say nothing at all.
I guess it's an insult to their intelligence as well.
They know it all. They have seen the light
and will soon smell the gas.

Now That the Democrats Have Won

Nov. 28, 2006

Now that the Democrats have won
the first thing they said was "No,
we won't do that.
Impeachment is not on the agenda.
Why, we have an election to win in 2008."

Follow that logic if you can.
It's not logic, it's complicity.
They are as guilty as the Bushists.
Fascists by default are fascists by consent,
worse because at least the killer has an agenda,
some backbone even if it is barbed wire,
whereas your Democrat just wrings his hands,
lamenting the unfortunate prospect
of nuclear winter, wars he will not attend
and neo-concentration camps.

They have sold us down the river
more than once and never tried to get us back.
The last ones worthy of the name
have heads of lead, in free fall
like the Towers, meeting no resistance.
Because there is an election to win.

The proof is in the pudding of the Wimpy burger brains
of Congressmen and women, Pelosi and Conyers
being no exceptions. Big Brother is clearly a Republican,
but he has two sons. One is a Democrat.
We have bought some time, that's all.
The next war and 9/11 have been postponed, not cancelled.

The Constitution's gone. Every soldier died in vain.
The jackboots are waiting. The Democrats have won.

Classroom Visitor

Nov. 29, 2006

What was her first name again?
No matter. She is Green and 26
and I am black and 60,
not Orange Country black, where she is from
but otherwise we look alike
and wonder what the Germans think of us
talking bad about our country
and Arnold Schwarzenegger, girlie-man,
needing a brassiere, Bush needing
to be thrown out on his ear, us needing
habeus corpus back, she saying
how scared everybody is
and what a wimp is
John McCain, who should know better
and probably does, but can't
do better, like the rest of them
including Democrats. 9/11.
Need any more be said?
Yes, she says, the polls are right.
People are saying it, but only behind closed doors.

Mr. Frischholz knows that Rumsfeld is being tried for war crimes
now in Germany, but he is absent today.
I say, foolishly, "Everybody should get excited
about that," knowing nobody will
but me and maybe Mr. Frischholz.
I say you've met a real American today
and almost say two.
She says nice to have met you, I say me too
and hear somebody tell her after class
"But I still like the States." He didn't get it.
We'll see what next week will bring
in Orange County, Germany
and on TV.

War of the Worlds

Dec. 8, 2006

What we need now is action, not words.
We can do it now, there's no excuse
for not doing it, and screaming bloody murder
the whole time, for 9/11 and Iraq, Afghanistan
and tearing up our Constitution, turning soldiers
into torturers, our country into a police state.

I saw War of the Worlds last night on TV.
It reminded me of 9/11, which I also saw on TV
and thought if it really happened the way they said it did
not boom boom boom boom boom
the way the firemen said, who after all were there
and as the pictures clearly show, even on TV
if you see with your eyes and not your ears
attuned only to Big Brother's lies and
outrageouser conspiracy theories
of 19 Arabs with box cutters "pulling" buildings
even without planes, in the case of Building 7.

Controlled Demolition, Inc. couldn't have done it better
if they didn't, though they did
collect the evidence and ship it off to China,
a federal offense, committed by the feds themselves,
and the same company they paid to sanitize
the federal building in Oklahoma City.

Oh but how could it have been an inside job
with the president's own brother Marvin's
old company in charge of security?
How could Osama have walked in and planted all those bombs
without them noticing? Impossible.
Tom Cruise saved his daughter in the movie
and the humans won, but will we?

Where are the streets filled with people,
a million men refusing to pay taxes
for which there is no law, or to accept
computerized voting machines that leave no trace,
the rule of aliens that suck our blood in wars for oil
and lie right in our faces, not caring any more
whether we believe them or not, as long as we do not
march in the streets, but only in combat boots
to their tune of "Sucker, give me your last dime
and your arms and legs as well, for nothing, for
that's what you are, while I and my beloved ass
and class of extraterrestrials take what is ours,
including you shitheads, fit only to clean our toilets
and maybe do research, if you behave yourself

so you can discover ways to make me live longer
and kill you quicker, without you even knowing it
you stupid fucks. That's the way it is
and always was and will be, now and forever,
on earth as it is in heaven, amen. Fuck you."

"Get out of my face or you're toast.
I'll have you for breakfast, chump.
Cry me a river. Watch me laugh
as your ass burns. Get the picture?
Now forget it and get back to work.
I've got things to do, and you're going to do them for me.
Be happy you're a part of it all.
We're going places, you and me.
The sky's the limit, you'll make it, pull it
up by your bootstraps, rags to riches.
Go for it, bitches. Who's your daddy?
Suck it high, suck it low, oh, oh, oh, you look so fine
when you're getting fucked."

"Ipse dixit, dickhead, dipshit, now hear this.
This is not a war of extermination,
like Tim Robbins said in the movie.
It's a class war. You're either with us or against us,
Wanna hear a goat story? Jeder Widerstand ist zwecklos.
Jedem das Seine."

But wait a minute. Is this Buchenwald
or Theresienstadt? Maybe we can use the ruse
to our advantage. Impeach them while we can,
get better jailors in, teach them to fear us, just a little,
so that, with time, we get it back
when they know, that is, we know
they can only go so far. Give them time to think
of what they're losing when they shoot us. Why,
we can sing and dance for them, invent computers,
spin on our heads like tops on street corners.
Even extraterrestrials must know that talent trickles up,
not down, despite their wishful thinking
to be beautiful, the one thing
they can never be.

Oh Beautiful

March 3, 2007

Oh Beautiful, your spacious skies
were never filled with so many lies
as on 9/11, when a caveman in Afghanistan
flew his planes into the Pentagon
and the World Trade Center, pulverizing two,
doing what no plane in history could ever do
and a third one, just for the heck of it
eight hours later, without even hitting it.

Taking up the story where it starts
of how Bin Laden beat the U.S. Air Farce
we see the answer right away:
he was trained by the CIA.
But no, it wasn't Bin Laden's men who flew those planes.
Not at all: they were Saddam Hussein's.

So we hung him, by logical deduction
because he had Weapons of Mass Destruction
not. And after all he was a tyrant,
for many years a friend and client,
just like that nasty Noriega down in Panama,
paid by the CIA Director, Dubya's pa.

Or, in the beginning, Ho Chi Minh
before we decided to do him in
for being a dirty domino, a commie,
though he survived, as did his country,
unlike several million Vietnamese
and 58,000 Americans, but jeez,
that's the price we had to pay
to teach him the American Way.

So when terror strikes, in the Gulf of Tonkin,
in Washington, or downtown Manhattan
we raise the flag higher, higher and higher.
Everybody must have his Reichstag fire.

But believe it or not, that is the question.
So let me make a small suggestion.
The next time they try it, for crissake,
make 'em get their story straight.
Or better yet, when they say go
stand up straight, and just say no.

Shake, Mohammed

March 20, 2007

Rockin' rollin', rattlin', movin', shakin'
incredible breath-taking, belief-defying mastermind,
the one and only Perpetrator, Mother of All Crimes,
'tis I, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed,
the most powerful superman of all mankind,
faster than the FAA and NORAD,
more powerful than the U.S. Air Force,
able to pulverize tall buildings with a single plane
and another one with no plane at all.

Look, to the skies!
My jet fuel burns at 2770 degrees and more,
cuts steel like thermite into truck-bed lengths
for easy transport to China, a federal offense,
after defying the laws of physics,
collapsing hundred-story buildings at free-fall speed
into their own footprints, vaporizing everything,
except one of my boys' passports.

Nothing beside remains.

At the Pentagon, the best-defended building on the planet,
my man Hani Hanjour, cleverly disguised as an incompetent,
who according to his flight instructor couldn't fly a Cessna 172,
pulled a 757 through a 270° spiral turn at 400 mph to hit the Pentagon precisely
where Donald Rumsfeld wasn't, but where the ONI was
and the records of the 1.3 trillion dollars were
that Rumsfeld had said the day before were "missing."

Then I had 100 tons of airplane vaporized inside the building,
leaving the lawn outside pristine, the windows on the second floor
unbroken, and a neat little 12-foot hole for whatever
punched through six walls and then also vaporized.

You see my jet fuel gets so damn hot it vaporizes steel
but not humans, which is why the military could identify
184 victims, but not the plane.

Rummy said it was a missile, but this was just a slip.

Finally, in Shanksville, my plane disappeared into thin earth,
leaving just a smoking hole.

No one can match these feats.

I did it all. I have defeated you.

Sure, to get me to confess they put me on the rack.
But look at what I did to you, and your red white and blue.

You will never get your country back.
I gave you the man of the new century, Big Brother,
the oldest burning bush, conqueror of nations, first the U.S.,
then Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran still to come,
Hegemond of Oilland, Destroyer of constitutions,
habeas corpus, peace and freedom,
Maker of concentration camps, military trials with torture,
preemptive warfare, CIA renditions,
Total Information Awareness and an 8.6 trillion dollar debt,
Filler of body bags, Commander-in-chief extraordinaire,
never having been to Vietnam but AWOL in Alabam
and a VP never adorned with a U.S. uniform.

With such enemies, who needs friends?

I kept your President in a children's classroom
listening to a goat's story, the Secret Service petrified
for 30 minutes and failing to order air cover
while the FAA and NORAD continued fumbling
and I with box cutters and a few good men
on the 9/11 Commission to get the story straight
and keep me out of it, along with Building 7
and most of the rest of what I'm telling you,
destroyed you. My genius is boundless.

I kept my boys' names off the flight manifests.
I killed three thousand people in one day.
I got the gold out of the basement, put the puts and called the calls,
told Giuliani the Towers were gonna fall,
and two people at Odigo.

I gave Mohammed Atta a hundred thousand dollars
via the head of Pakistan intelligence
who met with CIA the week preceding 9/11,
told Attorney-General Ashcroft not to fly
Willie Brown of San Francisco not to fly
Larry Silverstein to say he'd "pull it,"
the FBI to ignore their field agents
who had learned about my plans,
the Commission to ignore most everything,
like the president's brother Marvin's former company
being in charge of WTC security,
and lie about the rest,
like calling 47 massive steel Tower cores
"hollow steel shafts."

I told the BBC to say Building 7 had collapsed
23 minutes before it happened.

All of this just to create confusion
and encourage outrageous conspiracy theories,
which now you don't need anymore, because I am the man.

I am the most powerful person in the universe.
The first to bring steel-framed buildings down by fire.
The first to defeat the U.S. Air Defense Command.
The first to destroy American democracy.

I am Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, Sheikh of Sheikhs.
Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair.

The Cock-Up

March 29, 2007

When the BBC reports the fall of Building 7
23 minutes before it happens
you know this is not a "cock-up"
but a whistle blowing loud and clear
from inside the loop.

Just ask yourself the simplest questions.
Is the BBC the National Enquirer?
Has it ever happened before?
How could it happen?
Talk about the nose on your face.
Could it be any plainer?

An inside job within an inside job,
a veritable Russian doll of inside jobs,
a symphony of whistles.
NORAD, the FBI and CIA
hamstrung and defeated
by 19 Arabs with box cutters.
Do you really think they think
we are that stupid?

What is the message, then?
The one the Demo-rats have swallowed,
for example, and all the Congresswimps,
and the leaders of (almost) all the western countries
in their tribute to pox Americana?

Vince Salandria called it "transparency"
in reference to the JFK assassination.
I call it "let's show 'em that we've got 'em by the balls."
This is what they hope – that we will resign,
give up the ghost of freedom, accept our chains,
in lieu of worse. Covert dictatorship,
our left gatekeepers whisper, is better
than civil war, martial law, and concentration camps,
all of which are now provided for by law.
It can happen any time.
One more 9/11 will do the trick.

It's the lion tamer's mentality, don't you see.
All he has is a whip, and an air of dominance.
And of course a man with a rifle outside the cage.
But hey! Who else is there outside the cage?
Who are all those people, mesmerized,
waiting to see what will happen next?
How many rifles will the lion tamer need
to get them inside the cage?

Rosie O'Donnell

April 1, 2007

Can be sung to the tune of "Eileen O'Grady."

Rosie O'Donnell and Daniel O'Connell
We'll follow you into the fray
Two heroes of darin', one fightin' for Erin
And one for Americay

O'Reilly and Hanitty, where is their sanity
Flag-wavin' is all they can do
Perfidious traitors and collaborators
They can't hold a candle to you

Rosie, you're one of our kind, we want you to speak your mind
About 9/11 and Building 7
We know that explosions caused all that implosion
Never before, now or of yore
Did steel buildings fall by fire
So by whose volition, controlled demolition
Did they turn into dust and a funeral pyre?

You're fighting for reason, exposing the treason,
We're sick of their lies and their war
If it ever gets out, the true crimes of those louts
There'll be heaven to pay and much more

Rosie you're beautiful, truthful and dutiful
We're proud that you're standin' your ground
We'll teach them some manners who fly the false banners
And one day we'll bring them around

Sunrise at Buchenwald

Feb. 28, 2008

Hail, Sol Invictus.

Pray tell what mortal hand or eye
could frame such irony,
read from the inside:
Jedem das Seine.

We will not tolerate
outrageous conspiracy theories.
Preemptive war
and torture
will set you free.

On this drizzle of a day
the old god struggles
across cluttered cyberskies
fortunately returning
but still the iron stands.

It does not melt like buildings
struck by airplanes
or vaporize or sink into the earth
like airplanes
on certain days.

Reason is but a mode the mind abides in.
The rest is dark, like blood.

Waiting for Obama

Nov. 6, 2009

Waiting for Obama to turn the tide
is like asking the horsemen for a ride

to the Apocalypse. White or black,
red or pale, George or Barack,

the harbingers of doom will take us to the brink
until one day soon, without a thought left to think,

we have nothing to look forward to but dying
to the tune of gunfire, chains, and children crying.

If Obama were Kennedy he would be dead.
It's a plot to get us all, as Johnson said.[263]

They weren't fooling when they stole Obama's plane[264]
and buzzed Manhattan, with an excuse so lame

about it being nothing but a photo op
you'd have to be a moron to believe such slop.

We had a moron and thank God we replaced him
with a man of style, a brain, and good intention

but that's not nearly enough to stop the spooks,
the media mafia, the congresswimps and kooks

who worm their way onto and up the ladder
lying and caring about nothing but getting fatter.

Now we ask the poet what to do,
what is the best way forward, as if he knew.

"Stop signifying, give us something concrete."
"We the people," he begins, "on the street"

"And who will lead us," we interrupt him, "you?"
"Or are you just another one without a clue?"

"I'm afraid there's no one coming," says Mr. Blue,
"and if you know that, you know what to do."

"They'll gun us down like dogs and taser us
and throw us into FEMA camps[265] for all our fuss,

---

263 See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-m-gillon/a-new-wrinkle-in-the-jfk_b_339026.html.

264 See "Was the Air Force One Flyover a Warning to Obama?" in this volume.

265 See http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=7763.

take our homes and give them to the bankers,
bail out the bosses and the Wall Street wankers,

turn the lights off or invent some disease
and blame it on Socialism or the Iraqis.

send anthrax[266] to put congressmen in terror
or crash their plane[267] and blame it on pilot error

bomb our buildings and rush us into war
with fairy tales and arguments rotten to the core.

"Yes," says Mr. Blue, "that is our curse."
"Why else do you think I would write verse?"

With that poet and reader join hands
and watch the news about Afghanistan.

[266] See http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2008/08/anthrax-attack-was-state-sponsored.html.
[267] See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Vbf49kzWFw.